arXiv:1005.3565v4 [math.PR] 9 Mar 2011

Quadratic Reflected BSDEs with Unbounded Obstacles

Erhan Bayraktar*[†] , Song Yao[‡]

Abstract

In this paper, we analyze a real-valued reflected backward stochastic differential equation (RBSDE) with an unbounded obstacle and an unbounded terminal condition when its generator f has quadratic growth in the z-variable. In particular, we obtain existence, comparison, and stability results, and consider the optimal stopping for quadratic g-evaluations. As an application of our results we analyze the obstacle problem for semi-linear parabolic PDEs in which the non-linearity appears as the square of the gradient. Finally, we prove a comparison theorem for these obstacle problems when the generator is convex or concave in the z-variable.

Keywords: Quadratic reflected backward stochastic differential equations, convex/concave generator, θ-difference method, Legenre-Fenchel duality, optimal stopping problems for quadratic g-evaluations, stability, obstacle problems for semi-linear parabolic PDEs, viscosity solutions.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Notation and Preliminaries . . . 3
1.2 Reflected BSDEs . . . 4

2 Two A Priori Estimates **5**

3 A Monotone Stability Result **9**

4 Existence **16**

5 Comparison **18**

6 A Uniqueness Result **22**

7 An Optimal Stopping Problem for Quadratic g-Evaluations **26**

8 Stability **31**

9 An Obstacle Problem for PDEs. **38**

A Appendix **55**
A.1 Proof of (3.14) . . . 55
A.2 Comparison Theorem for Quadratic RBSDEs with Bounded Obstacles . . . 57
A.3 Two Gaps in [7]. . . . 58

---

*Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; email: `erhan@umich.edu`.

[†] E. Bayraktar is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under an applied mathematics research grant and a Career grant, DMS-0906257 and DMS-0955463, respectively, and in part by the Susan M. Smith Professorship.

[‡] Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; email: `songyao@umich.edu`.

1 Introduction

We consider a reflected backward stochastic differential equation (RBSDE) with generator f, terminal condition ξ and obstacle L

$$L_t \leq Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s)\, ds + K_T - K_t - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s\,, \qquad t \in [0,T], \tag{1.1}$$

where the solution (Y, Z, K) satisfies the so-called *flat-off* condition:

$$\int_0^T (Y_t - L_t) dK_t = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

and K is an increasing process. We will consider the case when f is allowed to have quadratic growth in the z-variable. Moreover, we will allow L and ξ to be unbounded.

The theory of RBSDEs is closely related to the theory of optimal stopping in that the snell-envelope can be represented as a solution of an RBSDE. These equations were first introduced by [9]. The authors provided the existence and uniqueness of an adapted solution for a real-valued RBSDE with square-integrable terminal condition under the Lipschitz hypothesis on the generator. There has been a few developments after this seminal result. Some generalizations were obtained for backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) without an obstacle and later they were generalized to RBSDEs:

1) [15] showed the existence of a maximal and a minimal solution for real-valued BSDEs, with square-integrable terminal condition when the generator f is only continuous and has linear growth in variables y and z. Then [19] adapted this result to the case of RBSDEs.

2) [13] established the existence, comparison, and stability results for real-valued quadratic BSDEs (when f is allowed to have quadratic growth in the z-variable) with bounded terminal condition. In the spirit of [21], the author gave a link between the solutions of BSDEs based on a diffusion and viscosity solutions of the corresponding semi-linear parabolic PDEs. [16] extended the existence result of quadratic BSDEs with bounded terminal condition to the case that the generator f can have a superlinear growth in the y-variable. [14] made a counterpart study for RBSDEs with bounded terminal condition and bounded obstacle when the generator f has superlinear growth in y and quadratic growth in z.

3) With help of a localization procedure and a priori bounds, [4] showed that the boundedness assumption on the terminal condition is not necessary for the existence of an adapted solution to a real-valued quadratic BSDE: One only needs to require the terminal condition has exponential moment of certain order. Correspondingly, [17] derived the existence result for quadratic RBSDEs with such an unbounded terminal condition, but still with a bounded obstacle.

Recently, [5], under the assumption that the generator f is additionally convex or concave in the z-variable, used a so-called "θ-difference" method to obtain comparison (thus uniqueness) and stability results for quadratic BSDEs with solutions having every exponential moment. Morever, [8] proved that uniqueness holds among solutions having a given exponential moment by using a verification theorem that relies on the Fenchel-Legendre dual of the generator. With these results they also showed that the solutions of BSDEs are viscosity solutions of PDEs which are quadratic in the gradient. On the other hand, [7] showed that these PDEs have unique solutions.

In the current paper, we extend the results of [5], [8], and [7] to RBSDEs. Alternatively, our results can be seen as an extension of [14] and [17] to the unbounded obstacles. We start by establishing two a priori estimates which will serve as our basic tools; see Section 2. The first one shows that any bounded Y has an upper bound in term of the terminal condition ξ and the obstacle L. The second estimate is on the $\mathbb{L}^p$ norms of Z and K. With the help of these two estimates, we can establish a monotone stability result (see Theorem 3.1) in the spirit of [13]. Then the existence follows as a direct consequence; see Theorem 4.1.

Next, we apply the aforementioned θ-difference method to derive a comparison theorem (see Theorems 5.1 and 5.2) for quadratic RBSDEs with unbounded terminal conditions and unbound obstacles when the generator f is additionally convex or concave in the z-variable. Instead of estimating the difference of two solutions Y

and $\widehat{Y}$, we estimate $Y - \theta\widehat{Y}$ for each $\theta \in (0,1)$, which allows us to utilize the convexity or the concavity of the generator f. In the concave-generator case, we prove a uniqueness result for RBSDEs using an argument that involves the Fenchel-Legendre dual of the generator, see Theorem 6.1. As opposed to [8] (or [1]), we are not relying on a verification argument but directly compare two solutions. Since it only requires a given exponential moment on solutions, this uniqueness result is more general than the one that would be implied by the above comparison theorem. We develop an alternative representation of the unique solution in Section 7, where we improve the results of Theorem 5.3 of [2] on optimal stopping for quadratic g-evaluations. Moreover, the convexity/concavity assumption on generator f in the z-variable as well as the θ-difference method are also used in deducing the stability result (see Theorem 8.1), which is crucial for the continuity property of the solutions of forward backward stochastic differential equations with respect to their initial conditions; see Proposition 9.1. This result together with the stability result gives a new proof of the flow property; see Proposition 9.2. A Picard-iteration procedure was introduced to show this property for BSDEs with Lipschitz generators, see e.g. Theorem 4.1 of [10]. However, it is not appropriate to apply such a Picard-iteration procedure to derive the flow property for quadratic RBSDEs.

Thanks to the flow property, the solution of the RBSDE is a viscosity solution of an associated obstacle problem for a semi-linear parabolic PDE, in which the non-linearity appears as the square of the gradient; see Theorem 9.1. It is worth pointing out that [8] shows the existence of a viscosity solution to a similar PDE (with a quadratic gradient term) without obstacle by approximating the generator f from below by a sequence of Lipschitz generators under a strong assumption that f^- has a linear growth in variables y and z. However, such a strong assumption is not necessary if we directly use the flow property to prove Theorem 9.1. Finally, we prove that in fact this obstacle problem has a unique solution, which is a direct consequence of Theorem 9.2, a comparison principle between a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution. Although inspired by Theorem 3.1 of [7], we prove Theorem 9.2 in a quite different way because there are two gaps in the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [7], see Remark 9.1.

1.1 Notation and Preliminaries

Throughout this paper we let B be a d-dimensional standard Brownian Motion defined on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, and consider the augmented filtration generated by it, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{F} = \Big\{\mathcal{F}_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sigma\Big(\sigma\big(B_s; s\in[0,t]\big)\cup\mathcal{N}\Big)\Big\}_{t\in[0,\infty)} ,$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is the collection of all P-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$. We fix a finite time horizon $T>0$. Let $\mathcal{S}_{0,T}$ be the collection of all $\mathbf{F}$-stopping times ν such that $0 \le \nu \le T$, P-a.s. For any $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$, we define $\mathcal{S}_{\nu,T} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T} \mid \nu \le \tau \le T,\ P\text{-a.s.}\}$. Moreover, we will use the convention $\inf\{\emptyset\} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \infty$.

The following spaces of functions will be used in the sequel:

1) Let $\mathbb{C}[0,T]$ denote the set of all real-valued continuous functions on $[0,T]$, and let $\mathbb{K}[0,T]$ be the subset of $\mathbb{C}[0,T]$ that consists of all real-valued increasing and continuous functions on $[0,T]$. For any $\{\ell_t\}_{t\in[0,T]} \in \mathbb{C}[0,T]$, we define $\ell_*^{\pm} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]} (\ell_t)^{\pm}$. Then

$$\ell_* \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\ell_t| = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \big((\ell_t)^- \vee (\ell_t)^+\big) = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} (\ell_t)^- \vee \sup_{t\in[0,T]} (\ell_t)^+ = \ell_*^- \vee \ell_*^+. \tag{1.3}$$

2) For any sub-σ-field $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{F}$, let

- $\mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{G})$ be the space of all real-valued, $\mathcal{G}$-measurable random variables;
- $\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\xi \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{G}) : \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{G})} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{E\Big[|\xi|^p\Big]\Big\}^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty\Big\}$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$;
- $\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\xi \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{G}) : \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{G})} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \operatorname*{esssup}\limits_{\omega\in\Omega} |\xi(\omega)| < \infty\Big\}$;

- $\mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\xi \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{G}) :\, E\big[e^{p|\xi|}\big] < \infty,\ \forall\, p \in (1,\infty)\Big\}$.

3) Let $\mathbb{B}$ be a generic Banach space with norm $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{B}}$. For any $p, q \in [1,\infty)$, we define three Banach spaces:

- $\mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})$ denotes the space of all $\mathbb{B}$-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted processes X with

$$\|X\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \bigg\{E\bigg[\Big(\int_0^T |X_t|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\,dt\Big)^{\frac{q}{p}}\bigg]\bigg\}^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty;$$

- $\mathbb{H}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})$ $\big($resp. $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})\big) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big\{X \in \mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B}) : X$ is $\mathbf{F}$-predictable (resp. $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable)$\big\}$.

When $p = q$, we simply write $\mathbb{L}^p_{\mathbf{F}}$, $\mathbb{H}^p_{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}^p_{\mathbf{F}}$ for $\mathbb{L}^{p,p}_{\mathbf{F}}$, $\mathbb{H}^{p,p}_{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{p,p}_{\mathbf{F}}$ respectively. Moreover we let

- $\mathbb{H}^{p,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})$ $\big($resp. $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{p,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})\big)$ denote the space of all $\mathbb{B}$-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-predictable (resp. $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable) processes X with $\int_0^T |X_t|^p_{\mathbb{B}}dt < \infty$, P-a.s. for any $p \in [1,\infty)$.

4) Let $\mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ be the space of all real-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted continuous processes. We need the following subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$.

- $\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, \|X\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \underset{\omega\in\Omega}{\operatorname{esssup}}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|X_t(\omega)\big|\Big) < \infty\Big\}$;
- $\mathbb{C}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \left\{X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, \|X\|_{\mathbb{C}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \bigg\{E\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|X_t|^p\Big]\bigg\}^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty\right\}$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$;
- $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big\{X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, X$ has finite variation$\big\}$;
- $\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big\{X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, X$ is an increasing process with $X_0 = 0\big\} \subset \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$;
- $\mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big\{X \in \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, X_T \in \mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_T)\big\}$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$;
- $\mathbb{E}^{\lambda,\lambda'}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, E\Big[e^{\lambda X^-_*} + e^{\lambda' X^+_*}\Big] < \infty\Big\} \subset \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{C}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in (0,\infty)$.

For any $\lambda \in (0,\infty)$, we set $\mathbb{E}^\lambda_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{E}^{\lambda,\lambda}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. For any $X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$, one can deduce from (1.3) that

$$E\big[e^{\lambda X_*}\big] = E\Big[e^{\lambda(X^-_* \vee X^+_*)}\Big] = E\Big[e^{\lambda X^-_*} \vee e^{\lambda X^+_*}\Big] \le E\Big[e^{\lambda X^-_*} + e^{\lambda X^+_*}\Big] \le 2E\big[e^{\lambda X_*}\big]\,, \tag{1.4}$$

which implies that $\mathbb{E}^\lambda_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] = \big\{X \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] :\, E\left[e^{\lambda X_*}\right] < \infty\big\}$. Moreover, for any $p \in [1,\infty)$, we set $\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{E}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$.

1.2 Reflected BSDEs

Let $\mathscr{P}$ denote the $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable σ-field on $[0,T] \times \Omega$. A *parameter set* (ξ, f, L) consists of a random variable $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, a function $f : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and a process $L \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ such that f is $\mathscr{P} \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable and that $L_T \le \xi$, P-a.s.

Definition 1.1. *Given a parameter set (ξ, f, L), a triplet $(Y, Z, K) \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ is called a solution of the* reflected backward stochastic differential equation *with terminal condition ξ, generator f, and obstacle L $\big($RBSDE (ξ, f, L) for short$\big)$, if* (1.1) *and* (1.2) *hold P-a.s.*

A function $f : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *Lipschitz* in (y,z) if for some $\lambda > 0$, it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$\big|f(t,\omega,y_1,\theta z_1) - f(t,\omega,y_2,z_2)\big| \le \lambda\big(|y_1 - y_2| + |z_1 - z_2|\big), \quad \forall\, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R},\ \forall\, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The theory of RBSDEs with Lipschitz generators was well developed in the seminal paper [9]. In this paper, we are interested in *quadratic* RBSDEs, i.e., the RBSDEs whose generators have quadratic growth in z in the following sense:

(H1) For three constants $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$|f(t,\omega,y,z)| \le \alpha + \beta|y| + \frac{\gamma}{2}|z|^2, \qquad \forall\, (y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In what follows, for any $\lambda \ge 0$ we let c_λ denote a generic constant depending on $\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ and T (in particular, c_0 stands for a generic constant depending on α, β, γ and T), whose form may vary from line to line.

2 Two A Priori Estimates

We first present an a priori estimate, which is an extension of Lemma 3.1 of [17].

Proposition 2.1. *Let (ξ, f, L) be a parameter set such that f satisfies (H1). If (Y, Z, K) is a solution of the quadratic RBSDE(ξ, f, L) such that $Y^+ \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$, then it holds P-a.s. that*

$$Y_t \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln E\left[e^{\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L^+_*)}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof: In light of Itô's formula, $(Y,Z,K) \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ with $Y^+ \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ is a solution of the RBSDE(ξ, f, L) if and only if

$$\big(\widetilde{Y}, \widetilde{Z}, \widetilde{K}\big) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big(e^{\gamma Y}, \gamma e^{\gamma Y} Z, \gamma \textstyle\int_0^\cdot e^{\gamma Y_s} dK_s\big) \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$$

is a solution of the RBSDE$(e^{\gamma\xi}, \widetilde{f}, e^{\gamma L})$ with

$$\widetilde{f}(t,\omega,y,z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{y>0\}} \left\{ \gamma y f\left(t, \omega, \frac{\ln y}{\gamma}, \frac{z}{\gamma y}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{|z|^2}{y} \right\}, \quad \forall\, (t,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let $\mu \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \alpha\gamma \vee \beta \vee 1$. One can deduce from (H1) that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\widetilde{f}(t,\omega,y,z) \le H(y) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} y\big(\mu + \beta \ln y\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{y \ge 1\}} + \mu \mathbf{1}_{\{y<1\}}, \quad \forall\, (y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.2}$$

Clearly, $H(\cdot)$ is a strictly positive, increasing, continuous and convex function with $\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{H(y)} dy = \infty$.

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\widetilde{T} \in [0,T]$, the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\phi(t) = e^{\gamma x} + \int_t^{\widetilde{T}} H\big(\phi(s)\big) ds, \quad t \in \big[0, \widetilde{T}\big]$$

can be solved as follows (cf. [4]):

(i) When $x \ge 0$: $\phi^{\widetilde{T}}_t(x) = \exp\Big\{\mu\varphi\big(\widetilde{T} - t\big) + \gamma x e^{\beta(\widetilde{T}-t)}\Big\}$, where $\varphi(s) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{e^{\beta s}-1}{\beta}\mathbf{1}_{\{\beta>0\}} + s\mathbf{1}_{\{\beta=0\}}$, $\forall\, s \in [0,T]$;

(ii) When $x < 0$: $\phi^{\widetilde{T}}_t(x) = \begin{cases} e^{\gamma x} + \mu(\widetilde{T} - t) < 1 + \mu(\widetilde{T} - t) \le e^{\mu(\widetilde{T}-t)} \le e^{\mu\varphi(\widetilde{T}-t)}, & \text{if } e^{\gamma x} + \mu(\widetilde{T} - t) < 1, \\ \exp\left\{\mu\varphi\left(\widetilde{T} - t + \frac{e^{\gamma x}-1}{\mu}\right)\right\} \le e^{\mu\varphi(\widetilde{T}-t)} & \text{if } e^{\gamma x} + \mu(\widetilde{T} - t) \ge 1. \end{cases}$

One can check that

(ϕ1) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\widetilde{T} \in [0,T]$, $t \to \phi^{\widetilde{T}}_t(x)$ is a decreasing and continuous function on $\big[0, \widetilde{T}\big]$;

(ϕ2) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0,T]$, $\widetilde{T} \to \phi^{\widetilde{T}}_t(x)$ is an increasing and continuous function on $\big[t, T\big]$;

(ϕ3) For any $0 \le t \le \widetilde{T} \le T$, $x \to \phi^{\widetilde{T}}_t(x)$ is an increasing and continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$;

(ϕ4) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \le t \le \widetilde{T} \le T$, $\phi^{\widetilde{T}}_t(x) \le \exp\big\{\mu\varphi(T) + \gamma x^+ e^{\beta T}\big\}$.

Let $\widetilde{\Omega} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \{\omega \in \Omega : \ L_T(\omega) \le \xi(\omega)$ and the path $t \to L_t(\omega)$ is continuous$\} \in \mathcal{F}$, which defines a measurable set with probability 1. Fix $\omega \in \widetilde{\Omega}$. Theorem 6.2 of [17] shows that the following reflected backward ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} e^{\gamma L_t(\omega)} \le \Lambda_t(\omega) = e^{\gamma \xi(\omega)} + \displaystyle\int_t^T H\big(\Lambda_s(\omega)\big)\, ds + k_T(\omega) - k_t(\omega)\,, \qquad t \in [0,T]\,, \\ \displaystyle\int_0^T \Big(\Lambda_s(\omega) - e^{\gamma L_s(\omega)}\Big)\, dk_s(\omega) = 0 \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution $\big(\Lambda_\cdot(\omega), k_\cdot(\omega)\big) \in \mathbb{C}[0,T] \times \mathbb{K}[0,T]$, which satisfies

$$\Lambda_t(\omega) = \sup_{s\in[t,T]} \bigg(\int_t^s H\big(\Lambda_r(\omega)\big)dr + e^{\gamma\xi(\omega)}\,\mathbf{1}_{\{s=T\}} + e^{\gamma L_s(\omega)}\mathbf{1}_{\{s<T\}} \bigg) = \sup_{s\in[t,T]} u_t^s(\omega), \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{2.3}$$

where $\{u_r^s(\omega)\}_{r\in[0,s]}$ is the unique solution of the following ODE

$$u_r^s(\omega) = e^{\gamma\xi(\omega)}\,\mathbf{1}_{\{s=T\}} + e^{\gamma L_s(\omega)}\,\mathbf{1}_{\{s<T\}} + \int_r^s H\big(u_a^s(\omega)\big)da, \quad r \in [0,s].$$

To wit, $u_r^s(\omega) = \phi_r^s\big(\xi(\omega)\,\mathbf{1}_{\{s=T\}} + L_s(\omega)\,\mathbf{1}_{\{s<T\}}\big)$. Then it follows from (2.3) and (ϕ4) that

$$0 < e^{\gamma L_t(\omega)} \le \Lambda_t(\omega) = \sup_{s\in[t,T]} u_t^s(\omega) \le \exp\Big\{ \mu\varphi(T) + \gamma e^{\beta T}\big(\xi^+(\omega) \vee L_*^+(\omega)\big) \Big\}, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.4}$$

For any $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$, one can deduce from (2.3) and (ϕ1) that

$$\Lambda_{t_1}(\omega) = \sup_{s\in[t_1,T]} u_{t_1}^s(\omega) \ge \sup_{s\in[t_2,T]} u_{t_1}^s(\omega) \ge \sup_{s\in[t_2,T]} u_{t_2}^s(\omega) = \Lambda_{t_2}(\omega), \tag{2.5}$$

Thus $t \to \Lambda_t(\omega)$ is a decreasing and continuous path. Moreover, for any $t \in [0,T]$ (2.3) and (ϕ2) imply that

$$\Lambda_t(\omega) = \sup_{s\in[t,T]} u_t^s(\omega) = \sup\Big\{ u_t^s(\omega) : s \in \big([t,T) \cap \mathbb{Q}\big) \cup \{T\} \Big\}. \tag{2.6}$$

For any $s \in [0,T]$, since $\xi\mathbf{1}_{\{s=T\}} + L_s\mathbf{1}_{\{s<T\}}$ is an $\mathcal{F}_s$-measurable random variable, the continuity of function $\phi_t^s(\cdot)$ by (ϕ3) implies that $\big\{u_t^s(\omega)\big\}_{\omega\in\Omega} = \phi_t^s\big(\xi\mathbf{1}_{\{s=T\}} + L_s\mathbf{1}_{\{s<T\}}\big)$ is also an $\mathcal{F}_s$-measurable random variable. Thus we can deduce from (2.6) that for any $t \in [0,T]$, the random variable Λ_t is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable (however, not necessarily $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable).

Now, let us introduce an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process $\mathfrak{f}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} E[H(\Lambda_t)|\mathcal{F}_t]$, $t \in [0,T]$. Since Λ is a decreasing process by (2.5), and since $H(\cdot)$ is an increasing function, it holds for any $0 \le t < s \le T$ that

$$E[\mathfrak{f}_s|\mathcal{F}_t] = E[H(\Lambda_s)|\mathcal{F}_t] \le E[H(\Lambda_t)|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathfrak{f}_t, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

which implies that $\mathfrak{f}$ is a supermartingale. As $Y^+ \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^\infty[0,T]$, it follows that $(\xi^+, L^+) \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T) \times \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^\infty[0,T]$. Then the continuity of process $H(\Lambda_\cdot)$, (2.4) and the Bounded Convergence Theorem imply that

$$E[\mathfrak{f}_t] = E[H(\Lambda_t)] = \lim_{s\downarrow t} E[H(\Lambda_s)] = \lim_{s\downarrow t} E[\mathfrak{f}_s], \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Thanks to Theorem 1.3.13 of [12], $\mathfrak{f}$ has a right-continuous modification $\widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}$. Hence, we can regard $\widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}$ as a generator that is independent of (y,z). It follows from Fubini's Theorem, Jensen's inequality as well as (2.4) that

$$E\int_0^T \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\big|^2 ds = \int_0^T E\Big[\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\big|^2\Big]\,ds = \int_0^T E\left[|\mathfrak{f}_s|^2\right] ds \le \int_0^T E\Big[E\big[|H(\Lambda_s)|^2\big|\mathcal{F}_s\big]\Big]ds = \int_0^T E\big[|H(\Lambda_s)|^2\big]ds < \infty.$$

Since $e^{\gamma\xi} \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma L} \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^\infty[0,T]$, Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 2.3 of [9] show that the RBSDE$(e^{\gamma\xi}, \widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}, e^{\gamma L})$ admits a unique solution $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{K}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^2[0,T] \times \mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{F}}^2\big([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d\big) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}^2[0,T]$ and that for any $t \in [0,T]$

$$\mathcal{Y}_t \;=\; \operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau\in\mathcal{S}_{t,T}} E\bigg[\int_t^\tau \widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\,ds + e^{\gamma\xi}\,\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + e^{\gamma L_\tau}\,\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_t\bigg], \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.7}$$

For any $t \in [0,T]$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{t,T}$, Fubini's Theorem implies that for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$

$$\begin{aligned} E\bigg[\mathbf{1}_A \int_t^\tau \widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\,ds\bigg] &= E\int_t^T \mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}\widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\,ds = \int_t^T E\Big[\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}\widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\Big]\,ds = \int_t^T E\left[\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}\mathfrak{f}_s\right] ds \\ &= \int_t^T E\left[\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}E[H(\Lambda_s)|\mathcal{F}_s]\right] ds = \int_t^T E\left[E\big[\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}H(\Lambda_s)\big|\mathcal{F}_s\big]\right] ds \\ &= \int_t^T E\left[\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}H(\Lambda_s)\right] ds = E\int_t^T \mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau\}}H(\Lambda_s)ds = E\bigg[\mathbf{1}_A \int_t^\tau H(\Lambda_s)ds\bigg]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $E\left[\int_t^\tau \widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\,ds\big|\mathcal{F}_t\right] = E\left[\int_t^\tau H(\Lambda_s)ds\big|\mathcal{F}_t\right]$, P-a.s. Then (2.7), (2.3) and (2.4) imply that for any $t \in [0,T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_t &= \underset{\tau\in\mathcal{S}_{t,T}}{\operatorname{esssup}} E\left[\int_t^\tau H(\Lambda_s)ds + e^{\gamma\xi}\,\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + e^{\gamma L_\tau}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \\ &\le E[\Lambda_t|\mathcal{F}_t] \le e^{\mu\varphi(T)}E\left[e^{\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+\vee L_*^+)}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \le C_*, \quad P\text{-a.s.}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

with $C_* \triangleq \exp\left\{\mu\varphi(T) + \gamma e^{\beta T}\Big(\|\xi^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)} \vee \|L^+\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\Big)\right\}$. By the continuity of process $\mathcal{Y}$, it holds P-a.s. that

$$0 < e^{\gamma L_t} \le \mathcal{Y}_t \le e^{\mu\varphi(T)}E\left[e^{\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+\vee L_*^+)}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \le C_*, \quad t\in[0,T], \tag{2.9}$$

which shows that $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ with $\|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]} \le C_*$.

To finalize the proof, it suffices to show that $P\left(\widetilde{Y}_t \le \mathcal{Y}_t,\ \forall\, t\in[0,T]\right) = 1$. To see this, we fix $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and define the $\mathbf{F}$-stopping time

$$\tau_n \triangleq \inf\left\{t\in[0,T] : \int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds > n\right\} \wedge T.$$

Clearly, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\uparrow \tau_n = T$, P-a.s. Applying Tanaka's formula to the process $(\widetilde{Y}-\mathcal{Y})^+$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} (\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge t} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge t})^+ &= (\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n})^+ + \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}\big(\widetilde{f}(s,\widetilde{Y}_s,\widetilde{Z}_s) - \widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\big)ds + \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}\big(d\widetilde{K}_s - d\mathcal{K}_s\big) \\ &\quad - \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}(\widetilde{Z}_s - \mathcal{Z}_s)\,dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} d\mathfrak{L}_s, \quad t\in[0,T], \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where $\mathfrak{L}$ is a real-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, increasing and continuous process known as "local time".

Since the function $H(\cdot)$ is increasing, continuous and convex, Jensen's inequality and (2.8) show that

$$H(\widetilde{Y}_s) - \mathfrak{f}_s \le H(\widetilde{Y}_s) - H\big(E[\Lambda_s|\mathcal{F}_s]\big) \le H(\widetilde{Y}_s) - H(\mathcal{Y}_s) \le C_H\big|\widetilde{Y}_s - \mathcal{Y}_s\big|, \quad s\in[0,T], \tag{2.11}$$

where C_H is the Lipschitz coefficient of function $H(\cdot)$ over $\left\{x\in\mathbb{R} : |x| \le \|\widetilde{Y}\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]} \vee \|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\right\}$. Moreover, the flat-off condition of $\big(\widetilde{Y},\widetilde{Z},\widetilde{K}\big)$ implies that

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}d\widetilde{K}_s = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{e^{\gamma L_s}=\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}d\widetilde{K}_s = 0, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.12}$$

Taking the expectation in (2.10), we can deduce from (2.2), Fubini's Theorem, (2.11) and (2.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[(\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge t} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge t})^+\right] - E\left[(\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n})^+\right] \\ &\quad\le E\int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau_n\}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}\big(\widetilde{f}(s,\widetilde{Y}_s,\widetilde{Z}_s) - \widetilde{\mathfrak{f}}_s\big)ds \le \int_t^T E\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau_n\}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}\big(H(\widetilde{Y}_s) - \mathfrak{f}_s\big)\right]ds \\ &\quad\le C_H\int_t^T E\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau_n\}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{Y}_s>\mathcal{Y}_s\}}(\widetilde{Y}_s - \mathcal{Y}_s)^+\right]ds \le C_H\int_t^T E\left[(\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge s} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge s})^+\right]ds, \quad t\in[0,T]. \end{aligned}$$

Then Gronwall's inequality shows that for any $t\in[0,T]$

$$E\left[(\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge t} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n\wedge t})^+\right] \le e^{C_H T}E\left[(\widetilde{Y}_{\tau_n} - \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_n})^+\right].$$

As $n\to\infty$, the continuity of processes $\widetilde{Y}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ and the Bounded Convergence Theorem imply that

$$E\left[(\widetilde{Y}_t - \mathcal{Y}_t)^+\right] = 0, \quad \text{thus} \quad \widetilde{Y}_t \le \mathcal{Y}_t, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Using the continuity of processes $\widetilde{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ again, we obtain $P\left(\widetilde{Y}_t \le \mathcal{Y}_t,\ \forall\, t\in[0,T]\right) = 1$, which together with (2.9) leads to (2.1). $\square$

For a solution (Y,Z,K) of a quadratic RBSDE(ξ,f,L) such that L_*^- and Y_*^+ have exponential moments of certain orders, the next result estimates the norms of (Z,K) in $\mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ for some $p\in(1,\infty)$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let (ξ, f, L) be a parameter set such that f satisfies (H1). If (Y, Z, K) is a solution of the quadratic RBSDE(ξ, f, L) such that $Y \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}[0,T]$ for some $\lambda, \lambda' > 1$ with $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda'} < 1$, then*

$$E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^p + K_T^p\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-} + e^{\lambda'\gamma Y_*^+}\right] < \infty, \quad \forall\, p \in \left(1, \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\right).$$

Proof: We set $p_o \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{p\,(\lambda+\lambda')}} \wedge 2 > 1$ and define $\mathbf{F}$-stopping times

$$\tau_n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \inf\left\{t \in [0,T] : \int_0^t e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds > n\right\} \wedge T, \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $E\big[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-}\big] < \infty$ and $Z \in \widehat{\mathbb{H}}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,loc}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$, it holds P-a.s. that $Y_*^- + \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds < \infty$. Then it follows that

$$\int_0^T e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds \le e^{p_o\gamma Y_*^-}\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds < \infty, \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

which implies that for P-a.s. $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists an $n(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tau_{n(\omega)}(\omega) = T$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, applying Itô's formula to the process $e^{-p_o\gamma Y}$ and using the fact that

$$\alpha + \beta x \le \left(\alpha \vee \frac{\beta}{(p_o^2 - p_o)\gamma}\right) e^{(p_o^2-p_o)\gamma x}, \quad \forall\, x \ge 0,$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{-p_o\gamma Y_0} + \frac{1}{2}p_o^2\gamma^2\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds \\
&\quad = e^{-p_o\gamma Y_{\tau_n}} - p_o\gamma\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s} f(s, Y_s, Z_s)ds - p_o\gamma\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}dK_s + p_o\gamma\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}Z_s dB_s \\
&\quad \le e^{p_o\gamma Y_*^-} + p_o\gamma\Big(\alpha\vee\tfrac{\beta}{(p_o^2-p_o)\gamma}\Big)\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s + (p_o^2-p_o)\gamma|Y_s|}ds + \frac{1}{2}p_o\gamma^2\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds \\
&\qquad + p_o\gamma\left|\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}Z_s dB_s\right|, \quad P\text{-a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Observe that

$$\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s + (p_o^2-p_o)\gamma|Y_s|}ds \le \int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o^2\gamma \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s<0\}}Y_s}ds \le \int_0^{\tau_n} e^{p_o^2\gamma\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s<0\}}Y_s^-}ds \le Te^{p_o^2\gamma Y_*^-}, \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

which together with the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and (2.13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
E\left[\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\right] &\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-} + \left|\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}Z_s dB_s\right|^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\right] \\
&\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-} + e^{\frac{\lambda}{2p_o}\gamma Y_*^-}\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}\lambda p_o^{-2}}\right] \\
&\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-}\right] + \frac{1}{2}E\left[\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $E\Big[\big(\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\big)^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\Big] < \infty$, it follows that $E\Big[\big(\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\big)^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\Big] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-}\Big]$. As $n \to \infty$, the Monotone Convergence Theorem gives that

$$E\left[\left(\int_0^T e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-}\right].$$

Observe that $\frac{\lambda p_o p}{\lambda - p_o^2 p} < \frac{\lambda p_o^2 p}{\lambda - p_o^2 p} \le \lambda'$. Thus, applying Young's inequality with $\widetilde{p} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - p_o^2 p}$ and $\widetilde{q} = \frac{\lambda}{p_o^2 p}$ yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^p\right] &\le E\left[e^{p_o p \gamma Y_*^+}\left(\int_0^T e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\right)^p\right] \\
&\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\frac{\lambda p_o p}{\lambda - p_o^2 p}\gamma Y_*^+} + \left(\int_0^T e^{-p_o\gamma Y_s}|Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\lambda p_o^{-2}}\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-} + e^{\lambda'\gamma Y_*^+}\right] < \infty. \qquad (2.14)
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, since $Y_* \le Y_*^- + Y_*^+$, it holds P-a.s. that

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_T &= Y_0 - \xi - \int_0^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds + \int_0^T Z_s dB_s \\
&\le \alpha T + (2 + \beta T)(Y_*^- + Y_*^+) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds + \left|\int_0^T Z_s dB_s\right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and (2.14) imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\big[K_T^p\big] &\le c_p\, E\left[1 + \big(Y_*^-\big)^p + \big(Y_*^+\big)^p + \left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^p + \left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] \\
&\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-} + e^{\lambda'\gamma Y_*^+} + \left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^p\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\, E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma Y_*^-} + e^{\lambda'\gamma Y_*^+}\right] < \infty. \qquad \square
\end{aligned}
$$

3 A Monotone Stability Result

Theorem 3.1. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\big\{(\xi_n, f_n, L^n)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a parameter set and let $(Y^n, Z^n, K^n) \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \mathbb{H}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ be a solution of the RBSDE(ξ_n, f_n, L^n) such that*

(M1) All generators f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy (H1) with the same constants $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$ and $\gamma > 0$;

(M2) There exists a function $f : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$, the mapping $f(t,\omega,\cdot,\cdot)$ is continuous and $f_n(t,\omega,y,z)$ converges to $f(t,\omega,y,z)$ locally uniformly in (y,z);

and that for some $L \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ and some real-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process Y, either of the following two holds:

(M3a) It holds P-a.s. that for any $t \in [0,T]$, $\{L^n_t\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{Y^n_t\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are both increasing sequences in n with $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\uparrow L^n_t = L_t$ and $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\uparrow Y^n_t = Y_t$ respectively;

(M3b) It holds P-a.s. that for any $t \in [0,T]$, $\{L^n_t\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{Y^n_t\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are both decreasing sequences in n with $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\downarrow L^n_t = L_t$ and $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\downarrow Y^n_t = Y_t$ respectively.

Denote $\mathscr{L}_t \triangleq (L^1_t)^- \vee L^-_t$ and $\mathscr{Y}_t \triangleq (Y^1_t)^+ \vee Y^+_t$, $\forall\, t \in [0,T]$. If $\Xi \triangleq E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*} + e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\right] < \infty$ for some $\lambda, \lambda' > 6$ with $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda'} < \frac{1}{6}$, then $Y \in \mathbb{E}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ and there exist $(Z,K) \in \bigcap\limits_{p\in\left(1,\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\right)} \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ such that the triplet (Y,Z,K) is a solution of the RBSDE(ξ, f, L) with $\xi \triangleq Y_T$.

Proof: Since it holds P-a.s. that

$$
-\mathscr{L}_t \le L^1_t \wedge L_t \le L^n_t \le Y^n_t \le Y^1_t \vee Y_t \le \mathscr{Y}_t, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad (3.1)
$$

The rest of the proof is divided into several steps.

1) Let $\lambda_o \triangleq 5 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'} - 6\right) < \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'} - 1$. It follows that $p_o \triangleq \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda\lambda' - \lambda_o(\lambda+\lambda')} \in \left(1, \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\right)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma(Y^n)^-_*} + e^{\lambda'\gamma(Y^n)^+_*}\Big] \le E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*} + e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\right] < \infty$ by (3.1), applying Proposition 2.2 with $p = p_o$ yields that

$$
E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z^n_s|^2 ds\right)^{p_o} + \big(K^n_T\big)^{p_o}\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\, E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma(Y^n)^-_*} + e^{\lambda'\gamma(Y^n)^+_*}\Big] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi < \infty, \qquad (3.2)
$$

which shows that $\{Z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded subset in the reflexive Banach space $\mathbb{H}^{2,2p_o}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence Theorem 5.2.1 of [25] implies that $\{Z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a weakly convergent subsequence (we still denote it by $\{Z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) with limit $Z\in\mathbb{H}^{2,2p_o}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Next, we show that this convergence is indeed a strong one in $\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. In the second step, we will introduce a function that will be useful in establishing this goal and develop several inequalities which will play important roles in the sequel.

2) Define a function $\phi(x)\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\frac{1}{\lambda_o\gamma}\big(e^{\lambda_o\gamma|x|}-\lambda_o\gamma|x|-1\big)\ge 0,\ \forall\,x\in\mathbb{R}$. Fix $n\in\mathbb{N}$. For any $m\in\mathbb{N}$ with $m\ge n$, since $\big|\phi'(x)\big|=e^{\lambda_o\gamma|x|}-1$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$, it follows from (3.1) that P-a.s.

$$|\phi'\left(Y^m_t-Y^n_t\right)|<e^{\lambda_o\gamma|Y^m_t-Y^n_t|}\le e^{\lambda_o\gamma(\mathscr{L}_t+\mathscr{Y}_t)},\quad t\in[0,T]. \tag{3.3}$$

Applying Itô's formula to the process $\phi\big(Y^m_\cdot-Y^n_\cdot\big)$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi\left(Y^m_t-Y^n_t\right)&+\frac12\int_t^T\phi''\left(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\right)|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2ds\\&=\phi\left(\xi_m-\xi_n\right)+\int_t^T\phi'\left(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\right)\big(f_m(s,Y^m_s,Z^m_s)-f_n(s,Y^n_s,Z^n_s)\big)ds\\&\quad+\int_t^T\phi'\left(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\right)\left(dK^m_s-dK^n_s\right)-\int_t^T\phi'\left(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\right)\left(Z^m_s-Z^n_s\right)dB_s,\quad t\in[0,T].\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

First, we argue that the stochastic integral term in (3.4) is a martingale. Applying Young's inequality with

$$p_1=\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_o},\quad p_2=\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda_o}\quad\text{and}\quad p_3=\left(1-\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p_2}\right)^{-1}=\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda\lambda'-\lambda_o(\lambda+\lambda')}=p_o, \tag{3.5}$$

we can deduce from the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, (3.3), and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\int_0^t\phi'\left(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\right)\left(Z^m_s-Z^n_s\right)dB_s\right|\right]&\le c_0E\left[\left(\int_0^T\big|\phi'(Y^m_s-Y^n_s)\big|^2|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2ds\right)^{\frac12}\right]\\&\le c_0E\left[\sup_{s\in[0,T]}\big|\phi'(Y^m_s-Y^n_s)\big|\cdot\left(1+\int_0^T|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2ds\right)\right]\\&\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,E\left[e^{\lambda_op_1\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda_op_2\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}+\left(1+\int_0^T|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2ds\right)^{p_o}\right]\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\big(1+\Xi\big)<\infty.\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Thus $\int_0^\cdot\phi'\left(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\right)\left(Z^m_s-Z^n_s\right)dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Letting $t=0$, taking expectation in (3.4), and using (H1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&E\left[\phi\big(Y^m_0-Y^n_0\big)\right]+\frac12E\int_0^T\phi''\big(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\big)|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2ds\le E\left[\phi\big(\xi_m-\xi_n\big)\right]+E\int_0^T\phi'\big(Y^m_s-Y^n_s\big)(dK^m_s-dK^n_s)\\&\quad+E\int_0^T\big|\phi'(Y^m_s-Y^n_s)\big|\bigg(2\alpha+\beta|Y^m_s|+\beta|Y^n_s|+\frac12\gamma\Big(2|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2+(\lambda_o-2)|Z_s-Z^n_s|^2+\big(3+\tfrac{9}{\lambda_o-5}\big)|Z_s|^2\Big)\bigg)ds,\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where we used the fact that $|Z^m_s|^2+|Z^n_s|^2\le 2|Z^m_s-Z^n_s|^2+3|Z^n_s|^2$ and that

$$|Z^n_s|^2\le\big(|Z_s-Z^n_s|+|Z_s|\big)^2\le\big(1+\tfrac{\lambda_o-5}{3}\big)|Z_s-Z^n_s|^2+\big(1+\tfrac{3}{\lambda_o-5}\big)|Z_s|^2.$$

Since it holds P-a.s. that

$$|Y^m_t-Y^n_t|\le|Y_t-Y^n_t|\le|Y_t-Y^1_t|,\quad t\in[0,T],$$

one can deduce from the monotonicity of functions ϕ and $|\phi'|$ that P-a.s., $\phi(\xi_m-\xi_n)\le\phi(\xi-\xi_n)$ and

$$\big|\phi'(Y^m_t-Y^n_t)\big|\le\big|\phi'(Y_t-Y^n_t)\big|\le\big|\phi'(Y_t-Y^1_t)\big|,\quad t\in[0,T]. \tag{3.8}$$

Similar, it holds P-a.s. that

$$\big|\phi'(L^m_t - L^n_t)\big| \le \big|\phi'(L_t - L^n_t)\big| \le \big|\phi'(L_t - L^1_t)\big|, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.9}$$

We also see from (3.6) that

$$E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y^m_s - Y^n_s)\big|\,|Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \le E\left[\sup_{s\in[0,T]}\big|\phi'(Y^m_s - Y^n_s)\big| \int_0^T |Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds\right] < \infty, \tag{3.10}$$

which together with (3.7), (3.8) and (3.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E\int_0^T \big(\phi'' - 2\gamma|\phi'|\big)\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)|Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds &\le 2E\left[\phi\left(\xi - \xi_n\right)\right] + 2E\int_0^T \phi'\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)\left(dK^m_s - dK^n_s\right) \\ &+E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|\Big(4\alpha + 2\beta(\mathscr{L}_s + \mathscr{Y}_s) + (\lambda_o - 2)\gamma|Z_s - Z^n_s|^2 + \big(3 + \tfrac{9}{\lambda_o - 5}\big)\gamma|Z_s|^2\Big)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now we estimate the second term on the right-hand-side of (3.11) by two cases of assumption (M3). Assume (M3a) first. Since ϕ' is an increasing and continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$, the flat-off condition of (Y^m, Z^m, K^m), (3.2) and (3.9) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} E\int_0^T \phi'\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)\left(dK^m_s - dK^n_s\right) &\le E\int_0^T \phi'\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)dK^m_s \le E\int_0^T \phi'\left(Y^m_s - L^n_s\right)dK^m_s \\ = \;& E\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^m_s = L^m_s\}}\phi'\left(Y^m_s - L^n_s\right)dK^m_s = E\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^m_s = L^m_s\}}\phi'\left(L^m_s - L^n_s\right)dK^m_s \\ \le \;& \|K^m_T\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_T)}\left\|\phi'\left(L^m - L^n\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]} \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}}\left\|\phi'\left(L - L^n\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

On the other hand, it holds for the case of (M3b) that

$$\begin{aligned} E\int_0^T \phi'\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)\left(dK^m_s - dK^n_s\right) &\le -E\int_0^T \phi'\left(L^m_s - Y^n_s\right)dK^n_s = -E\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^n_s = L^n_s\}}\phi'\left(L^m_s - L^n_s\right)dK^n_s \\ &\le \|K^n_T\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_T)}\left\|\phi'\left(L^m_\cdot - L^n_\cdot\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]} \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}}\left\|\phi'\left(L - L^n\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

3) Since the sequence $\Big\{\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m - Y^n)\big|}\big(Z^m - Z^n\big)\Big\}_{m\ge n}$ weakly converges to

$$\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y - Y^n)\big|}\big(Z - Z^n\big) \text{ in } \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{3.14}$$

which is proved in Subsection A.1, Theorem 5.1.1 ii) of [25] shows that

$$E\int_0^T \big|\phi'\big(Y_s - Y^n_s\big)\big|\,|Z_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \le \varliminf_{m\to\infty} E\int_0^T \big|\phi'\big(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\big)\big|\,|Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds. \tag{3.15}$$

As $\mathbb{H}^{2,2p_o}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$, the sequence $\{Z^m\}_{m\ge n}$ also weakly converges to Z in $\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. Applying Theorem 5.1.1 ii) of [25] once again, we can deduce from (3.11)-(3.13) and (3.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_o\gamma E\int_0^T |Z_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \le \lambda_o\gamma \varliminf_{m\to\infty} E\int_0^T |Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \\ &= \varlimsup_{m\to\infty} E\int_0^T \big(\phi'' - \lambda_o\gamma|\phi'|\big)\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)|Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \quad \big(\because \phi''(x) - \lambda_o\gamma|\phi'(x)| = \lambda_o\gamma, \ \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}\big) \\ &= \varlimsup_{m\to\infty} E\int_0^T \big(\phi'' - 2\gamma|\phi'|\big)\left(Y^m_s - Y^n_s\right)|Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds - (\lambda_o - 2)\gamma \varliminf_{m\to\infty} E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y^m_s - Y^n_s)\big||Z^m_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \\ &\le 2E\left[\phi\left(\xi - \xi_n\right)\right] + c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}}\left\|\phi'\left(L - L^n\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]} \\ &\quad + E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|\Big(4\alpha + 2\beta(\mathscr{L}_s + \mathscr{Y}_s) + \big(3 + \tfrac{9}{\lambda_o - 5}\big)\gamma|Z_s|^2\Big)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Since $\lambda_o < \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}$, it follows that $\lambda' > \frac{\lambda_o\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_o}$. Applying Young's inequality with $\widetilde{p} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_o}$ and $\widetilde{q} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_o}$, we can deduce from (3.1) that P-a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\le \phi\left(\xi-\xi_n\right) \le \tfrac{1}{\lambda_o\gamma} e^{\lambda_o\gamma|\,\xi-\xi_n|} \le \tfrac{1}{\lambda_o\gamma} e^{\lambda_o\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)} \\ &\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\big(e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\frac{\lambda_o\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_o}\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\big) \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\big(e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\big), \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

As $E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\right] < \infty$, the continuity of function ϕ and the Dominated Convergence Theorem imply that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow E\left[\phi\left(\xi-\xi_n\right)\right] = 0. \tag{3.18}$$

Next, we analyze the convergence of the second term on the right-hand-side of (3.16). In virtue of Dini's Theorem, it holds P-a.s. that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}\big|L_t-L_t^n\big| = 0$. Then the continuity of function ϕ' implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\left|\phi'\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|L_t-L_t^n\big|\right)\right| = \lim_{n\to\infty}\exp\left\{\lambda_o\gamma\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|L_t-L_t^n\big|\right\}-1 \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\exp\big\{\lambda_o\gamma\big|L_t-L_t^n\big|\big\}-1 = \lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|\phi'\big(L_t-L_t^n\big)\big|, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.9) that P-a.s.

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(L_t-L_t^n\right)\right|^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}} \le \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(L_t-L_t^1\right)\right|^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}, \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Applying Young's inequality with $\widetilde{p} = \frac{\lambda+\lambda'}{\lambda'}$ and $\widetilde{q} = \frac{\lambda+\lambda'}{\lambda}$, one can deduce from (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(L_t-L_t^1\right)\right|^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}\right] &= E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(L_t-L_t^1\right)\right|^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda_o(\lambda+\lambda')}}\right] \le E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma|L_t-L_t^1|}\right] \\ &\le E\left[e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)}\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\right] < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

The Dominated Convergence Theorem then implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(L_t-L_t^n\right)\right|^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}\right] = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Similar to (3.19), one has

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(Y_t-Y_t^1\right)\right|^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}\right] \le E\left[e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)}\right] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\Xi < \infty. \tag{3.21}$$

Now we will analyze the convergence of the third term on the right-hand-side of (3.16). We can deduce from (3.8), (3.1), as well as (A.3) that P-a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|\phi'(Y_t-Y_t^n)\big|\Big(4\alpha+2\beta(\mathscr{L}_t+\mathscr{Y}_t)+\big(3+\tfrac{9}{\lambda_o-5}\big)\gamma|Z_t|^2\Big) \le \big|\phi'(Y_t-Y_t^1)\big|\Big(4\alpha+4\beta\big(\mathscr{L}_t+\mathscr{Y}_t\big)+\big(3+\tfrac{9}{\lambda_o-5}\big)\gamma|Z_t|^2\Big) \\ &\quad \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\big|\phi'(Y_t-Y_t^1)\big|e^{\left(\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}-\lambda_o\right)\gamma(\mathscr{L}_t+\mathscr{Y}_t)} + \big(3+\tfrac{9}{\lambda_o-5}\big)\gamma\big|\phi'(Y_t-Y_t^1)\big||Z_t|^2 \\ &\quad \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_t+\mathscr{Y}_t)} + \big(3+\tfrac{9}{\lambda_o-5}\big)\gamma\big|\phi'(Y_t-Y_t^1)\big||Z_t|^2, \quad \forall\, t\in[0,T],\ \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Young's inequality, (3.19) and (3.21) show that

$$\begin{aligned} &E\int_0^T e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_t+\mathscr{Y}_t)}dt + E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y_t-Y_t^1)\big||Z_t|^2dt \\ &\quad \le TE\left[e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)}\right] + c_{\lambda,\lambda'}E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\phi'\left(Y_t-Y_t^1\right)\right|^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}} + \left(\int_0^T|Z_t|^2dt\right)^{p_o}\right] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then the continuity of function ϕ' and the Dominated Convergence Theorem imply that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y_s-Y^n_s)\big|\Big(4\alpha+2\beta(\mathscr{L}_s+\mathscr{Y}_s)+\big(3+\tfrac{9}{\lambda_o-5}\big)\gamma|Z_s|^2\Big)ds=0,$$

which together with (3.18) and (3.20) leads to that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T |Z_s-Z^n_s|^2ds=0. \tag{3.22}$$

Therefore, the sequence $\{Z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ strongly converges to Z in $\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. Consequently, Doob's martingale inequality implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\int_0^t \big(Z_s-Z^n_s\big)dB_s\right|^2\right]=0. \tag{3.23}$$

In the next step, we will show that $Y\in\mathbb{E}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$.

4) We first develop a few auxiliary results. By (3.22), we can extract a subsequence of $\{Z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (we still denote it by $\{Z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) such that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} Z^n_t=Z_t$, $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. In fact, we can choose this subsequence so that $Z^*\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}}|Z^n|\in\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$; see [15] or [13, Lemma 2.5]. By (M2), it holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$f\big(t,\omega,y,z\big)=\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n\big(t,\omega,y,z\big),\qquad \forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.24}$$

which together with the measurability of f_n, $n\in\mathbb{N}$ implies that f is also $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable. Moreover, we see from (3.24) and (M1) that f also satisfies (H1). For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega)\in[0,T]\times\Omega$, the continuity of mapping $f(t,\omega,\cdot,\cdot)$ shows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\big|f\big(t,\omega,Y^n_t(\omega),Z^n_t(\omega)\big)-f\big(t,\omega,Y_t(\omega),Z_t(\omega)\big)\big|=0. \tag{3.25}$$

On the other hand, (M2) implies that for $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega)\in[0,T]\times\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}0\ &\le\ \varlimsup_{n\to\infty}\big|f_n\big(t,\omega,Y^n_t(\omega),Z^n_t(\omega)\big)-f\big(t,\omega,Y^n_t(\omega),Z^n_t(\omega)\big)\big|\\ &\le\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\sup\Big\{\big|f_n\big(t,\omega,y,z\big)-f\big(t,\omega,y,z\big)\big|:\ |y|\le|Y^1_t(\omega)|\vee|Y_t(\omega)|<\infty,\ |z|\le Z^*_t(\omega)<\infty\Big\}\Big)=0,\end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.25) yields that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\big|f_n\big(t,\omega,Y^n_t(\omega),Z^n_t(\omega)\big)-f\big(t,\omega,Y_t(\omega),Z_t(\omega)\big)\big|=0. \tag{3.26}$$

Moreover, (H1) and (3.1) show that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\big|f_n(t,Y^n_t,Z^n_t)-f\big(t,Y_t,Z_t\big)\big|\ &\le\ 2\alpha+\beta|Y^n_t|+\beta|Y_t|+\frac{\gamma}{2}\big(\big|Z^n_t\big|^2+\big|Z_t\big|^2\big)\\ &\le\ 2\alpha+2\beta(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)+\frac{\gamma}{2}\big(\big|Z^*_t\big|^2+\big|Z_t\big|^2\big),\quad \forall\,n\in\mathbb{N}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Let us assume that except on a P-null set $\mathscr{N}$, (3.26), (3.27) hold for a.e. $t\in[0,T]$ and $\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*+\int_0^T\big(\big|Z^*_t\big|^2+\big|Z_t\big|^2\big)dt<\infty$. For any $\omega\in\mathscr{N}^c$, the Dominated Convergence Theorem implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^T\big|f_n\big(t,\omega,Y^n_t(\omega),Z^n_t(\omega)\big)-f\big(t,\omega,Y_t(\omega),Z_t(\omega)\big)\big|\,dt=0. \tag{3.28}$$

For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, integrating with respect to t in (3.27) yields that

$$\int_0^T\big|f_n\big(t,\omega,Y^n_t(\omega),Z^n_t(\omega)\big)-f\big(t,\omega,Y_t(\omega),Z_t(\omega)\big)\big|\,dt\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'\gamma}{(\lambda+\lambda')p_o}(\mathscr{L}_*(\omega)+\mathscr{Y}_*(\omega))}+\frac{\gamma}{2}\int_0^T\Big(\big|Z^n_t(\omega)\big|^2+\big|Z_t(\omega)\big|^2\Big)dt.$$

Then it follows from (3.19) and (3.2) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big|f_n\big(t,,Y_t^n,Z_t^n\big)-f\big(t,Y_t,Z_t\big)\big|\,dt\bigg)^{p_o}\bigg] &\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}E\bigg[e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)}+\bigg(\int_0^T\big|Z_t^n\big|^2dt\bigg)^{p_o}+\bigg(\int_0^T\big|Z_t\big|^2dt\bigg)^{p_o}\bigg]\\
&\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\Xi+c_{\lambda,\lambda'}E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T\big|Z_t\big|^2dt\bigg)^{p_o}\bigg]<\infty, \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N},
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that $\Big\{\Big(\int_0^T \big|f_n\big(t,,Y_t^n,Z_t^n\big)-f\big(t,Y_t,Z_t\big)\big|\,dt\Big)^{\frac{1+p_o}{2}}\Big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable sequence in $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Hence, one can deduce from (3.28) that

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty}E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big|f_n\big(t,Y_t^n,Z_t^n\big)-f\big(t,Y_t,Z_t\big)\big|\,dt\bigg)^{\frac{1+p_o}{2}}\bigg]=0. \tag{3.29}
$$

Similar to (3.17), it holds P-a.s. that

$$
\big(\xi-\xi_n\big)^2\le c_0e^{\lambda_o\gamma|\xi-\xi_n|}\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\big(e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\big), \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}.
$$

As $E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\Big]<\infty$, applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we obtain

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow E\Big[\big(\xi-\xi_n\big)^2\Big]=0. \tag{3.30}
$$

Since $|\phi'(x)|=e^{\lambda_o\gamma|x|}-1\ge\lambda_o\gamma|x|$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$, one can deduce from (3.20) that

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow \|L-L^n\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}=0. \tag{3.31}
$$

Moreover, for any $p\in[1,\infty)$, (3.1) and (3.19) imply that

$$
\|Y^n\|^p_{\mathbb{C}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\le E\Big[\big(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*\big)^p\Big]\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\,E\Big[e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)}\Big]\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\,\Xi\,, \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.32}
$$

Now for any $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$ with $m\ge n$, applying Itô's formula to the process $\big(Y^m_\cdot-Y^n_\cdot\big)^2$ yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(Y_t^m-Y_t^n)^2+\int_t^T\big|Z_s^m-Z_s^n\big|^2ds&=(\xi_m-\xi_n)^2+2\int_t^T\big(Y_s^m-Y_s^n\big)\big(f_m(s,Y_s^m,Z_s^m)-f_n(s,Y_s^n,Z_s^n)\big)ds\\
+2\int_t^T\big(Y_s^m-Y_s^n\big)(dK_s^m-dK_s^n)&-2\int_t^T\big(Y_s^m-Y_s^n\big)\,(Z_s^m-Z_s^n)\,dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}
$$

Let us estimate the term $\int_t^T\big(Y_s^m-Y_s^n\big)(dK_s^m-dK_s^n)$ still under two cases of assumption (M3). Assume (M3a) first. The flat-off condition of (Y^m,Z^m,K^m) implies that P-a.s.

$$
\int_t^T(Y_s^m-Y_s^n)(dK_s^m-dK_s^n)\le\int_t^T(Y_s^m-L_s^n)dK_s^m=\int_t^T(L_s^m-L_s^n)dK_s^m\le K_T^m\sup_{s\in[0,T]}\big|L_s^m-L_s^n\big|, \quad t\in[0,T].
$$

On the other hand, it holds for the case of (M3b) that P-a.s.

$$
\int_t^T(Y_s^m-Y_s^n)(dK_s^m-dK_s^n)\le\int_t^T(Y_s^n-L_s^m)dK_s^n=\int_t^T(L_s^n-L_s^m)dK_s^n\le K_T^n\sup_{s\in[0,T]}\big|L_s^m-L_s^n\big|, \quad t\in[0,T].
$$

Then (3.33), Hölder's inequality, (3.2), the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and (3.32) imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^m-Y_t^n|^2\bigg]&\le E\big[(\xi_m-\xi_n)^2\big]+2\|Y^m-Y^n\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o+1}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}\big\|f_m(\cdot,Y^m_\cdot,Z^m_\cdot)-f_n(\cdot,Y^n_\cdot,Z^n_\cdot)\big\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}_{\mathbf{F}}^{1,\frac{1+p_o}{2}}([0,T];\mathbb{R})}\\
&\quad+c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}}\|L^m-L^n\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}+c_0\,E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^m-Y_t^n|\cdot\bigg(\int_0^T\big|Z_s^m-Z_s^n\big|^2ds\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigg]\\
&\le E\Big[(\xi_m-\xi_n)^2\Big]+c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\Xi^{\frac{p_o-1}{p_o+1}}\,\|f_m(\cdot,Y^m_\cdot,Z^m_\cdot)-f_n(\cdot,Y^n_\cdot,Z^n_\cdot)\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}_{\mathbf{F}}^{1,\frac{1+p_o}{2}}([0,T];\mathbb{R})}\\
&\quad+c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}}\|L^m-L^n\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}+c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\Xi^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\|Z^m-Z^n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)}\cdot
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we can deduce from (3.29)-(3.31) and (3.22) that $\{Y^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathbb{C}^2_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. Let $\widetilde{Y}$ be its limit in $\mathbb{C}^2_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. As $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\downarrow E\Big[\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y^n_t-\widetilde{Y}_t\big|^2\Big]=0$, there exists a subsequence $\big\{n_i\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}\downarrow\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y^{n_i}_t-\widetilde{Y}_t\big|=0$, P-a.s. Then the monotonicity of the sequence $\big\{Y^n\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ by (M3) implies that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\downarrow\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y^n_t-\widetilde{Y}_t\big|=0$, P-a.s. Thus it holds P-a.s.that $\widetilde{Y}_t=\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}Y^n_t=Y_t$, $\forall\,t\in[0,T]$, which shows that processes $\widetilde{Y}$ and Y are indistinguishable. To wit, Y is a continuous process that satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y^n_t-Y_t\big|=0,\quad P\text{-a.s.}\tag{3.34}$$

Since $E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma Y^-_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma Y^+_*}\Big]\le E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma\mathscr{L}_*}+e^{\lambda'\gamma\mathscr{Y}_*}\Big]<\infty$ by (3.1), we see that $Y\in\mathbb{E}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$.

In the next step, we will construct a process $K\in\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ such that (Y,Z,K) is a solution of the quadratic RBSDE(ξ,f,L).

5) Since Y is a continuous process by step 4,

$$K_t\overset{\triangle}{=}Y_0-Y_t-\int_0^t f(s,Y_s,Z_s)\,ds+\int_0^t Z_s dB_s,\quad t\in[0,T]\tag{3.35}$$

defines an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, continuous process with $K_0=0$. In light of (3.29) and (3.23), there exists a subsequence of $\big\{(Y^n,Z^n)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ $\big($we still denote it by $\big\{(Y^n,Z^n)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\big)$ such that P-a.s.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left\{\int_0^T\big|f_n(t,Y^n_t,Z^n_t)-f\big(t,Y_t,Z_t\big)\big|\,dt+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\int_0^t\big(Z^n_s-Z_s\big)dB_s\right|\right\}=0.$$

This together with (3.34) leads to that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|K^n_t-K_t|=0,\quad P\text{-a.s.},\tag{3.36}$$

which implies that K is also an increasing process. To wit, $K\in\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. Letting $n\to\infty$ in (3.1), we can deduce from (3.35) that P-a.s.

$$L_t\le Y_t=\xi+\int_t^T f(s,Y_s,Z_s)\,ds+K_T-K_t-\int_t^T Z_s dB_s\,,\qquad t\in[0,T].$$

6) It remains to verify that (Y,Z,K) satisfies the flat-off condition (1.2). For any $p\in[1,\infty)$, similar to (3.32), (3.1) implies that P-a.s.

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y_t-Y^n_t\big|^p\le\big(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*\big)^p\le c_{\lambda,\lambda',p}\,e^{\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\gamma(\mathscr{L}_*+\mathscr{Y}_*)},\quad\forall\,n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Then one can deduce from (3.34), (3.19) and the Dominated Convergence Theorem that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y_t-Y^n_t\big|^p\right]=0.\tag{3.37}$$

For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, let us show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}E\int_0^T(Y_t-L_t)dK^n_t=0\tag{3.38}$$

by two cases of assumption (M3). Assume (M3a) first. One can deduce from the flat-off condition of (Y^n,Z^n,K^n) and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}0\ &\le\ E\int_0^T(Y_t-L_t)dK^n_t\le E\int_0^T(Y_t-L^n_t)dK^n_t=E\int_0^T(Y_t-Y^n_t)dK^n_t\\&\le\ \|K^n_T\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_T)}\|Y-Y^n\|_{\mathbb{C}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\,\Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}}\|Y-Y^n\|_{\mathbb{C}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.38) follows from (3.37). On the other hand, it holds for the case of (M3b) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\le E\int_0^T (Y_t - L_t)dK_t^n \le E\int_0^T (Y_t^n - L_t)dK_t^n = E\int_0^T (L_t^n - L_t)dK_t^n \\ &\le \|K_T^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_T)} \|L - L^n\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]} \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\, \Xi^{\frac{1}{p_o}} \|L - L^n\|_{\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\frac{p_o}{p_o-1}}[0,T]}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.38) follows from (3.31).

Now fix an $\omega \in \Omega$ such that (3.36) holds and that $t \to Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)$ is a non-negative continuous function on $[0,T]$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $N = N(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$0 \le \int_0^T \big(Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)\big)dK_t(\omega) \le \varepsilon + \sum_{j=1}^N m_j(\omega)\big(K_{\frac{j}{N}}(\omega) - K_{\frac{j-1}{N}}(\omega)\big),$$

where $m_j(\omega) \overset{\triangle}{=} \min\limits_{t\in[\frac{j-1}{N},\frac{j}{N}]} \big(Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)\big)$. Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \le \int_0^T \big(Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)\big)dK_t(\omega) &\le \varepsilon + \sum_{j=1}^N m_j(\omega)\big(K^n_{\frac{j}{N}}(\omega) - K^n_{\frac{j-1}{N}}(\omega)\big) + 2\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|K_t^n(\omega) - K_t(\omega)| \sum_{j=1}^N m_j(\omega) \\ &\le \varepsilon + \int_0^T \big(Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)\big)dK_t^n(\omega) + 2\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|K_t^n(\omega) - K_t(\omega)\big| \sum_{j=1}^N m_j(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

As $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$0 \le \int_0^T \big(Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)\big)dK_t(\omega) \le \varepsilon + \varliminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T (Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega))dK_t^n(\omega).$$

Then letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ yields that

$$0 \le \int_0^T \big(Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega)\big)dK_t(\omega) \le \varliminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T (Y_t(\omega) - L_t(\omega))dK_t^n(\omega).$$

Eventually, Fatou's Lemma and (3.38) imply that

$$0 \le E\int_0^T \big(Y_t - L_t\big)dK_t \le E\left[\varliminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T (Y_t - L_t)dK_t^n\right] \le \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T (Y_t - L_t)dK_t^n = 0,$$

which leads to (1.2).

7) In the previous steps we constructed a solution of the quadratic RBSDE(ξ, f, L), namely (Y, Z, K). Since $Y \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}[0,T]$, Proposition 2.2 shows that $(Z, K) \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,2p}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}^p[0,T]$ for any $p \in \Big(1, \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\Big)$. □

4 Existence

Theorem 4.1. *Let (ξ, f, L) be a parameter set such that f satisfies (H1) and that*

$$\textit{For } dt \otimes dP\textit{-a.e. } (t,\omega) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\,, \textit{ the mapping } f(t,\omega,\cdot,\cdot) \textit{ is continuous.} \tag{4.1}$$

If $E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma L_*^-} + e^{\lambda'\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L_*^+)}\Big] < \infty$ for some $\lambda, \lambda' > 6$ with $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda'} < \frac{1}{6}$, then the quadratic RBSDE(ξ, f, L) admits a solution $(Y, Z, K) \in \bigcap\limits_{p\in\big(1,\frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\big)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}[0,T] \times \mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,2p}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}^p[0,T]$ that satisfies (2.1).

In addition, if $\xi^+ \vee L_* \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then this solution (Y, Z, K) belongs to $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{F}}^p[0,T]$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$. More precisely, for any $p \in (1,\infty)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\big[e^{p\gamma Y_*}\big] \le E\Big[e^{p\gamma L_*^-}\Big] + c_p\, E\Big[e^{p\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L_*^+)}\Big] < \infty, \\ \textit{and} \quad & E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^p + K_T^p\right] \le c_p\, E\big[e^{3p\gamma Y_*}\big] < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Proof: Let $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $x^i \stackrel{\triangle}{=} x \vee (-i)$ and $x^{i,n} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big(x \vee (-i)\big) \wedge n$. It is plain to check that

$$\big(x^i\big)^- \vee \big(x^{i,n}\big)^- \le x^- \quad \text{and} \quad \big(x^i\big)^+ \vee \big(x^{i,n}\big)^+ \le x^+. \tag{4.3}$$

Theorem 1 of [14] shows that the quadratic RBSDE$\big(\xi^{i,n}, f, L^{i,n}\big)$ admits a maximal bounded solution $\big(Y^{i,n}, Z^{i,n}, K^{i,n}\big) \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. Then one can deduce from Proposition 2.1 and (4.3) that P-a.s.

$$-L^-_t \le -\big(L^{i,n}_t\big)^- \le L^{i,n}_t \le Y^{i,n}_t \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln E\left[e^{\gamma e^{\beta T}\left((\xi^{i,n})^+ \vee (L^{i,n})^+_*\right)} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t\right] \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln M_t, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{4.4}$$

where $M_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} E\left[e^{\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L^+_*)} \big| \mathcal{F}_t\right]$. Moreover, Proposition A.1 implies that P-a.s.

$$Y^{i+1,n}_t \le Y^{i,n}_t \le Y^{i,n+1}_t, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.5}$$

Now fix $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It is clear that $L^i \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ and that $\{L^{i,n}_t\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence in n with $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \uparrow L^{i,n}_t = L^i_t$ for any $t \in [0,T]$. We see from (4.4) and (4.5) that except on a P-null set $\mathscr{N}_i$, $\{Y^{i,n}_t\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence in n with an upper bound $c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln M_t$ for any $t \in [0,T]$. Thus, one can define a real-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process $Y^i_t(\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega \notin \mathscr{N}_i\}} \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \uparrow Y^{i,n}_t(\omega)$, $(t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$. Note that on $\mathscr{N}^c_i$

$$Y^i_T = \lim_{n\to\infty} \uparrow Y^{i,n}_T = \lim_{n\to\infty} \uparrow \xi^{i,n} = \xi^i. \tag{4.6}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in (4.4) yields that P-a.s.

$$-L^-_t \le Y^i_t \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln M_t, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.7}$$

By (4.3), $\mathscr{L}^i_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big(L^{i,1}_t\big)^- \vee \big(L^i_t\big)^- \le L^-_t$, $\forall\, t \in [0,T]$. Also, (4.4) and (4.7) imply that P-a.s.

$$\mathscr{Y}^i_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big(Y^{i,1}_t\big)^+ \vee \big(Y^i_t\big)^+ \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln M_t, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Then it follows from Doob's martingale inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma \mathscr{L}^i_*} + e^{\lambda'\gamma \mathscr{Y}^i_*}\right] &\le E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma L^-_*}\right] + c_{\lambda'} E\left[M^{\lambda'}_*\right] \le E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma L^-_*}\right] + c_{\lambda'} E\left[M^{\lambda'}_T\right] \\ &= E\left[e^{\lambda\gamma L^-_*}\right] + c_{\lambda'} E\left[e^{\lambda'\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L^+_*)}\right] < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Thus Theorem 3.1 shows that $Y^i \in \mathbb{E}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ and that there exist $(Z^i, K^i) \in \bigcap\limits_{p \in \left(1, \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\right)} \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ such that (Y^i, Z^i, K^i) is a solution of the quadratic RBSDE$\,(Y^i_T, f, L^i)$. Moreover, letting $n \to \infty$ in (4.5) yields that P-a.s.

$$Y^{i+1}_t \le Y^i_t, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.9}$$

Clearly, $\{L^i_t\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence in i with $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \downarrow L^i_t = L_t$ for any $t \in [0,T]$. We see from (4.7) and (4.9) that except on a P-null set $\mathscr{N}$, $\{Y^i_t\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence in i with a lower bound $-L^-_t$ for any $t \in [0,T]$. Thus, one can define a real-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process $Y_t(\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega\notin\mathscr{N}\}} \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \downarrow Y^i_t(\omega)$, $(t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$. Letting $i \to \infty$ in (4.6) and (4.7) yields that P-a.s.

$$Y_T = \lim_{i\to\infty} \downarrow Y^i_T = \lim_{i\to\infty} \downarrow \xi^i = \xi, \tag{4.10}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad -L^-_t \le Y_t \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln M_t, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.11}$$

By (4.3), $\mathscr{L}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \big(L^1_t\big)^- \vee L^-_t \le L^-_t$, $\forall\, t \in [0,T]$. Moreover, (4.7) and (4.11) imply that P-a.s.

$$\mathscr{Y}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \big(Y^1_t\big)^+ \vee Y^+_t \le c_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\ln M_t, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Similar to (4.8), one can deduce that $E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma \mathscr{L}_*} + e^{\lambda'\gamma \mathscr{Y}_*}\Big] \le E\Big[e^{\lambda\gamma L^-_*}\Big] + c_{\lambda'} E\Big[e^{\lambda'\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L^+_*)}\Big] < \infty$. Then Theorem 3.1 and (4.10) imply that $Y \in \mathbb{E}^{\lambda\gamma,\lambda'\gamma}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ and that there exist $(Z,K) \in \underset{p \in \left(1, \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}\right)}{\cap} \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ such that (Y,Z,K) is a solution of the quadratic RBSDE (ξ, f, L).

Next, let us assume that $\xi^+ \vee L_* \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$. For any $p \in (1,\infty)$, we can deduce from (1.4), (4.11) and Doob's martingale inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} E\big[e^{p\gamma Y_*}\big] &\le E\Big[e^{p\gamma Y^-_*} + e^{p\gamma Y^+_*}\Big] \le E\Big[e^{p\gamma L^-_*}\Big] + c_p\, E\big[M^p_*\big] \le E\Big[e^{p\gamma L^-_*}\Big] + c_p\, E\big[M^p_T\big] \\ &= E\Big[e^{p\gamma L^-_*}\Big] + c_p\, E\Big[e^{p\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L^+_*)}\Big] \le c_p\, E\Big[e^{p\gamma e^{\beta T}(\xi^+ \vee L_*)}\Big] < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $Y \in \mathbb{E}^{p\gamma}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. Finally, an application of Proposition 2.2 with $\lambda = \lambda' = 3p$ leads to (4.2). □

5 Comparison

A function $f : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *convex* (resp. *concave*) in z if it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$\begin{aligned} & f\big(t,\omega,y,\theta z_1 + (1-\theta) z_2\big) \\ &\qquad \le (\text{resp. } \ge)\ \theta f(t,\omega,y,z_1) + (1-\theta) f(t,\omega,y,z_2), \ \ \forall\,(\theta,y) \in (0,1) \times \mathbb{R}, \ \ \forall\, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

In the rest of the paper, we impose two more hypotheses on generator f which together imply (4.1).

(H2) f is *Lipschitz* in y: For some $\kappa \ge 0$, it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$|f(t,\omega,y_1,z) - f(t,\omega,y_2,z)| \le \kappa |y_1 - y_2|, \quad \forall\, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \ \ \forall\, z \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.2}$$

(H3) f is either convex or concave in z.

From now on, for any $\lambda \ge 0$ the generic constant c_λ also depends on κ implicitly. Inspired by the "θ-difference" method introduced in [5], we obtain two comparison theorems for quadratic RBSDEs with unbounded obstacles.

Theorem 5.1. *Let* (ξ, f, L), $(\hat{\xi}, \hat{f}, \widehat{L})$ *be two parameter sets and let* (Y,Z,K) *(resp.* $(\widehat{Y}, \widehat{Z}, \widehat{K})$*) be a solution of RBSDE*(ξ, f, L) *(resp. RBSDE*$(\hat{\xi}, \hat{f}, \widehat{L})$*) such that*

(C1) It holds P*-a.s. that* $\xi \le \hat{\xi}$ *and that* $L_t \le \widehat{L}_t$ *for any* $t \in [0,T]$*;*

(C2) $E\Big[e^{\lambda Y^+_*} + e^{\lambda \widehat{Y}^-_*}\Big] < \infty$ *for all* $\lambda \in (1,\infty)$ *and* $K \in \mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ *for some* $p \in (1,\infty)$*.*

For $\alpha, \beta, \kappa \ge 0$, $\gamma > 0$*, if either of the following two holds:*

(i) f *satisfies (H1), (H2),* f *is convex in* z*, and* $\Delta f(t) \overset{\triangle}{=} f\big(t, \widehat{Y}_t, \widehat{Z}_t\big) - \hat{f}\big(t, \widehat{Y}_t, \widehat{Z}_t\big) \le 0$, $dt \otimes dP$*-a.e.;*

(ii) $\hat{f}$ *satisfies (H1), (H2),* $\hat{f}$ *is convex in* z*, and* $\Delta f(t) \overset{\triangle}{=} f(t, Y_t, Z_t) - \hat{f}(t, Y_t, Z_t) \le 0$, $dt \otimes dP$*-a.e.;*

then it holds P*-a.s. that* $Y_t \le \widehat{Y}_t$ *for any* $t \in [0,T]$*.*

Proof: Fix $\theta \in (0,1)$. We set $U \overset{\triangle}{=} Y - \theta \widehat{Y}$, $V \overset{\triangle}{=} Z - \theta \widehat{Z}$ and define an $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable process

$$\begin{aligned} a_t \ \overset{\triangle}{=}\ & \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t \ge 0\}} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t \ne \widehat{Y}_t\}} \frac{\mathfrak{F}\big(t, Y_t, \widehat{Z}_t\big) - \mathfrak{F}\big(t, \widehat{Y}_t, \widehat{Z}_t\big)}{Y_t - \widehat{Y}_t} - \kappa \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t = \widehat{Y}_t\}} \right) - \kappa \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t < 0 \le \widehat{Y}_t\}} \\ & + \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t \vee \widehat{Y}_t < 0\}} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{U_t \ne 0\}} \frac{\mathfrak{F}(t, Y_t, Z_t) - \mathfrak{F}\big(t, \theta \widehat{Y}_t, Z_t\big)}{U_t} - \kappa \mathbf{1}_{\{U_t = 0\}} \right), \quad t \in [0,T], \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where $\mathfrak{F}$ stands for f if (i) holds, and for $\hat{f}$ otherwise. It follows that $A_t \triangleq \int_0^t a_s\,ds$, $t \in [0,T]$ is an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process. By (H2), it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that $|a_t| \le \kappa$. Thus $A_* \triangleq \sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]} |A_t| \le \int_0^T |a_s| ds \le \kappa T$, P-a.s. In light of (H1) and the convexity of $\mathfrak{F}$ in z, it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$\mathfrak{F}(t,y,Z_t) \le \theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,y,\widehat{Z}_t\big)+(1-\theta)\mathfrak{F}\bigg(t,y,\frac{V_t}{1-\theta}\bigg) \le \theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,y,\widehat{Z}_t\big)+(1-\theta)\big(\alpha+\beta|y|\big)+\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|V_t|^2, \quad \forall\, y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.4}$$

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the $\mathbf{F}$-stopping time

$$\tau_n \triangleq \inf\bigg\{t\in[0,T] : \int_0^t \big(|Z_s|^2+\big|\widehat{Z}_s\big|^2\big)ds > n\bigg\} \wedge T. \tag{5.5}$$

Clearly, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \uparrow \tau_n = T$, P-a.s. Let $\zeta_\theta \triangleq \frac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}$. Applying Itô's formula to the process $\Gamma_t \triangleq \exp\big\{\zeta_\theta e^{A_t} U_t\big\}$, $t \in [0,T]$ yields that

$$\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t} = \Gamma_{\tau_n} + \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} G_s ds + \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \Gamma_s e^{A_s}\big(dK_s-\theta d\widehat{K}_s\big) - \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \Gamma_s e^{A_s} V_s dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T],$$

where $G_t = \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(f(t,Y_t,Z_t)-\theta\hat{f}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t)-a_tU_t-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_\theta e^{A_t}|V_t|^2\Big)$. Clearly, it holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$G_t \le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t)-\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t)-a_tU_t-\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|V_t|^2\Big) \tag{5.6}$$

whether (i) or (ii) holds. Moreover, let us show by 3 cases that

$$G_t \le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\,\Gamma_t\Big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)\big(Y_t^+ + \widehat{Y}_t^-\big)\Big), \quad dt\otimes dP\text{-a.e.} \tag{5.7}$$

1) For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega)\in\{Y_t(\omega)\ge 0\}$, applying (5.4) with $y=Y_t$, we can deduce from (5.6) and (H2) that

$$\begin{aligned} G_t &\le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(\theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,Y_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)-\theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)-a_tU_t+(1-\theta)\big(\alpha+\beta|Y_t|\big)\Big)\\ &= \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big((\theta-1)\,a_tY_t+(1-\theta)\big(\alpha+\beta|Y_t|\big)\Big) \le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\Gamma_t\big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)|Y_t|\big) = \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\Gamma_t\big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)Y_t^+\big). \end{aligned}$$

2) For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega)\in\{Y_t(\omega)<0\le\widehat{Y}_t(\omega)\}$, applying (5.4) with $y=0$, we see from (5.6) and (H2) that

$$\begin{aligned} G_t &\le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(\big|\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t)-\mathfrak{F}(t,0,Z_t)\big|+\mathfrak{F}(t,0,Z_t)-\theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)+\kappa\big(Y_t-\theta\widehat{Y}_t\big)-\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|V_t|^2\Big)\\ &\le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(\theta\big|\mathfrak{F}\big(t,0,\widehat{Z}_t\big)-\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)\big|+(1-\theta)\alpha-\kappa\theta\widehat{Y}_t\Big) \le \alpha\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\Gamma_t. \end{aligned}$$

3) For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega)\in\{Y_t(\omega)\vee\widehat{Y}_t(\omega)<0\}$, applying (5.4) with $y=\widehat{Y}_t$, we see from (5.6) and (H2) that

$$\begin{aligned} G_t &\le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(\mathfrak{F}(t,\theta\widehat{Y}_t,Z_t)-\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t)-\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|V_t|^2\Big)\\ &\le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(\big|\mathfrak{F}(t,\theta\widehat{Y}_t,Z_t)-\mathfrak{F}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,Z_t)\big|+\mathfrak{F}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,Z_t)-\theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)-\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|V_t|^2\Big)\\ &\le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\Gamma_t\big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)\big|\widehat{Y}_t\big|\big) = \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\Gamma_t\big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)\widehat{Y}_t^-\big). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we define a process

$$D_t \triangleq \exp\bigg\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_0^t\Big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)\big(Y_s^+ + \widehat{Y}_s^-\big)\Big)ds\bigg\}, \quad t\in[0,T]. \tag{5.8}$$

Fix $t\in[0,T]$. Integration by parts and (5.7) imply that P-a.s.

$$\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t} \le D_{\tau_n\wedge t}\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t} \le D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n} + \zeta_\theta\int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}dK_s - \zeta_\theta\int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}V_s dB_s. \tag{5.9}$$

Since it holds P-a.s. that $L_s \le \widehat{L}_s \le \widehat{Y}_s$ for any $s \in [0,T]$, the flat-off condition of (Y,Z,K) implies that P-a.s.

$$\int_0^T D_s\Gamma_s\,dK_s=\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s=L_s\}}D_s\Gamma_s\,dK_s\le\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s\le \widehat{Y}_s\}}D_s\Gamma_s\,dK_s\le\int_0^T D_s e^{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_s^+}dK_s\le \eta K_T \qquad (5.10)$$

with $\eta \overset{\triangle}{=} \exp\Big\{(\beta{+}\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T}\widehat{Y}_*^-+\big(1{+}(\beta{+}\kappa)T\big)\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+\Big\}$. Hölder's inequality and (C2) imply that

$$E\big[\eta(1+K_T)\big] \le \|\eta\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\mathcal{F}_T)}\Big(1{+}\big\|K_T\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_T)}\Big){<}\,\infty, \qquad (5.11)$$

$$\text{and} \qquad E\left[D_T\Gamma_*\right] \le E\Big[\exp\Big\{\big((\beta+\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T}+\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big)\big(Y_*^+ + \widehat{Y}_*^-\big)\Big\}\Big] < \infty. \qquad (5.12)$$

Then the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality shows that

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\int_0^{\tau_n\wedge t} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}V_s dB_s\right|\right] \le c_0 E\left[D_T\Gamma_* e^{A_*}\left(\int_0^{\tau_n}|V_s|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \le c_0\sqrt{n}\,E\left[D_T\Gamma_*\right]<\infty. \qquad (5.13)$$

Thus $\int_0^{\tau_n\wedge\cdot} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}V_s dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale.

Taking $E\big[\,\cdot\,\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big]$ in (5.9), we can deduce from (5.10)-(5.12) that P-a.s.

$$\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t}{\le} E\big[D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n}\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big]{+}c_0\zeta_\theta E\big[\eta K_T\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big]{=}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n<t\}}D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n}{+}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n\ge t\}}E\big[D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big]{+}c_0\zeta_\theta E\big[\eta K_T\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big].$$

As $n\to\infty$, the Dominated Convergence Theorem, (5.12) and (5.11) imply that P-a.s.

$$\Gamma_t{\le} E\big[D_T\Gamma_T\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big]{+}c_0\zeta_\theta E\big[\eta K_T\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big]{\le} E\Big[D_T\, e^{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\xi^+}\Big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big]{+}c_0\zeta_\theta E\big[\eta K_T\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big]{\le} c_0(1{\vee}\zeta_\theta)E\big[\eta(1{+}K_T)\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big],$$

which leads to that

$$Y_t-\theta\widehat{Y}_t \le \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(1\vee\tfrac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}\Big)\,e^{-\kappa T-A_t}{+}\tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\big(c_0{+}\ln E[\eta(1+K_T)|\mathcal{F}_t]\big)e^{-\kappa T-A_t}, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \qquad (5.14)$$

Letting $\theta\to 1$ yields that $Y_t-\widehat{Y}_t\le 0$, P-a.s. Then the continuity of processes Y and $\widehat{Y}$ proves the theorem. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let (ξ,f,L), $(\hat{\xi},\hat{f},\widehat{L})$ be two parameter sets and let $(Y,Z,K)\big($resp. $(\widehat{Y},\widehat{Z},\widehat{K})\big)$ be a solution of RBSDE(ξ,f,L) $\big($resp. RBSDE$(\hat{\xi},\hat{f},\widehat{L})\big)$ such that (C1), (C2) hold. For $\alpha,\beta,\kappa\ge 0$, $\gamma>0$, if either of the following two holds:*

(i) f satisfies (H1), (H2), f is concave in z, and $\Delta f(t)\overset{\triangle}{=} f(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t)-\hat{f}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t)\le 0$, $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.;

(ii) $\hat{f}$ satisfies (H1), (H2), $\hat{f}$ is concave in z, and $\Delta f(t)\overset{\triangle}{=} f(t,Y_t,Z_t)-\hat{f}(t,Y_t,Z_t)\le 0$, $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.;

then it holds P-a.s. that $Y_t\le\widehat{Y}_t$ for any $t\in[0,T]$.

Proof: Fix $\theta\in(0,1)$. We set $\widetilde{U}\overset{\triangle}{=}\theta Y-\widehat{Y}$, $\widetilde{V}\overset{\triangle}{=}\theta Z-\widehat{Z}$ and define an $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable process

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{a}_t \quad &\overset{\triangle}{=}\quad \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t\ge 0\}}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{U}_t\neq 0\}}\frac{\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\theta Y_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)-\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)}{\widetilde{U}_t}-\kappa\mathbf{1}_{\{\widetilde{U}_t=0\}}\right)-\kappa\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t<0\le\widehat{Y}_t\}}\\ &\qquad +\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t\vee\widehat{Y}_t<0\}}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t\neq\widehat{Y}_t\}}\frac{\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t)-\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,Z_t\big)}{Y_t-\widehat{Y}_t}-\kappa\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t=\widehat{Y}_t\}}\right),\quad t\in[0,T],\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{F}$ stands for f if (i) holds, and for $\hat{f}$ otherwise. It follows that $\widetilde{A}_t\overset{\triangle}{=}\int_0^t\widetilde{a}_s\,ds$, $t\in[0,T]$ is an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process with $\widetilde{A}_*\overset{\triangle}{=}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\big|\widetilde{A}_t\big|\le\int_0^T\big|\widetilde{a}_s\big|ds\le\kappa T$, P-a.s. In light of (H1) and the concavity of $\mathfrak{F}$ in z, it holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$\mathfrak{F}\big(t,y,\widehat{Z}_t\big)\ge\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,y,Z_t){+}(1{-}\theta)\mathfrak{F}\left(t,y,\frac{-\widetilde{V}_t}{1{-}\theta}\right)\ge\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,y,Z_t){-}(1{-}\theta)\big(\alpha{+}\beta|y|\big){-}\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}\big|\widetilde{V}_t\big|^2,\quad\forall\, y\in\mathbb{R}. \quad (5.15)$$

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we still define the **F**-stopping time τ_n as in (5.5). Let $\zeta_\theta \overset{\triangle}{=} \frac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}$. Applying Itô's formula to the process $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \exp\big\{\zeta_\theta e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\widetilde{U}_t\big\}$, $t \in [0,T]$ yields that

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\tau_n\wedge t} = \widetilde{\Gamma}_{\tau_n} + \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \widetilde{G}_s\, ds + \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \widetilde{\Gamma}_s e^{\widetilde{A}_s}(\theta dK_s - d\widehat{K}_s) - \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \widetilde{\Gamma}_s e^{\widetilde{A}_s}\widetilde{V}_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where $\widetilde{G}_t = \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\theta f(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \hat{f}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t) - \widetilde{a}_t\widetilde{U}_t - \frac{1}{2}\zeta_\theta e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\big|\widetilde{V}_t\big|^2\Big)$. Clearly, it holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$\widetilde{G}_t \le \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \mathfrak{F}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t) - \widetilde{a}_t\widetilde{U}_t - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}\big|\widetilde{V}_t\big|^2\Big) \tag{5.16}$$

whether (i) or (ii) holds. Moreover, let us show by 3 cases that

$$\widetilde{G}_t \le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t\Big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)\big(Y_t^+ + \widehat{Y}_t^-\big)\Big), \quad dt\otimes dP\text{-a.e.} \tag{5.17}$$

1) For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega) \in \{Y_t(\omega) \ge 0\}$, applying (5.15) with $y = Y_t$, we can deduce from (5.16) and (H2) that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{G}_t &\le \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \mathfrak{F}\big(t,\theta Y_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big) - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}\big|\widetilde{V}_t\big|^2\Big)\\ &\le \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\big|\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,\widehat{Z}_t) - \mathfrak{F}(t,\theta Y_t,\widehat{Z}_t)\big| + (1-\theta)\big(\alpha + \beta|Y_t|\big)\Big)\\ &\le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t\big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)|Y_t|\big) = \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t\big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)Y_t^+\big).\end{aligned}$$

2) For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega) \in \{Y_t(\omega) < 0 \le \widehat{Y}_t(\omega)\}$, applying (5.15) with $y = 0$, we see from (5.16) and (H2) that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{G}_t &\le \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\theta\big|\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \mathfrak{F}(t,0,Z_t)\big| + \theta\mathfrak{F}(t,0,Z_t) - \mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big) + \kappa\big(\theta Y_t - \widehat{Y}_t\big) - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}\big|\widetilde{V}_t\big|^2\Big)\\ &\le \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\big|\mathfrak{F}\big(t,0,\widehat{Z}_t\big) - \mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t\big)\big| + (1-\theta)\alpha - \kappa\widehat{Y}_t\Big) \le \alpha\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t.\end{aligned}$$

3) For $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. $(t,\omega) \in \{Y_t(\omega) \vee \widehat{Y}_t(\omega) < 0\}$, applying (5.15) with $y = \widehat{Y}_t$, we see from (5.16) and (H2) that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{G}_t &\le \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big(\theta\mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,\widehat{Y}_t,Z_t\big) - \widetilde{a}_t\widetilde{U}_t + (1-\theta)\big(\alpha + \beta\big|\widehat{Y}_t\big|\big)\Big)\\ &= \zeta_\theta\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_t e^{\widetilde{A}_t}\Big((1-\theta)\widetilde{a}_t\widehat{Y}_t + (1-\theta)\big(\alpha + \beta\big|\widehat{Y}_t\big|\big)\Big) \le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t\big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)\big|\widehat{Y}_t\big|\big) = \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t\big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)\widehat{Y}_t^-\big).\end{aligned}$$

Let D be the **F**-adapted process defined in (5.8). Fix $t \in [0,T]$. Similar to (5.9), integration by parts and (5.17) imply that P-a.s.

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\tau_n\wedge t} \le D_{\tau_n}\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\tau_n} + \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}_s e^{\widetilde{A}_s} dK_s - \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}_s e^{\widetilde{A}_s}\widetilde{V}_s dB_s. \tag{5.18}$$

Similar to (5.10), the flat-off condition of (Y,Z,K) implies that $\int_0^T D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}_s dK_s \le \widetilde{\eta}K_T$, P-a.s. with $\widetilde{\eta} \overset{\triangle}{=} \exp\Big\{(\beta+\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+ + \big(1+(\beta+\kappa)T\big)\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widehat{Y}_*^-\Big\}$. Hölder's inequality and (C2) imply that

$$E\big[\widetilde{\eta}(1+K_T)\big] \le \|\widetilde{\eta}\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\mathcal{F}_T)}\Big(1 + \big\|K_T\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_T)}\Big) < \infty \tag{5.19}$$

and $E\Big[D_T\widetilde{\Gamma}_*\Big] \le E\Big[\exp\Big\{\big((\beta+\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T} + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big)\big(Y_*^+ + \widehat{Y}_*^-\big)\Big\}\Big] < \infty$. Similar to (5.13), the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality shows that $\int_0^{\tau_n\wedge\cdot} D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}_s e^{\widetilde{A}_s}\widetilde{V}_s dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Taking $E\big[\cdot\,\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big]$ in (5.18) and using the similar arguments to those that lead to (5.14), we can deduce from (5.19) that

$$\theta Y_t - \widehat{Y}_t \le \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(1 \vee \tfrac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}\Big)\, e^{-\kappa T - \widetilde{A}_t} + \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\big(c_0 + \ln E[\widetilde{\eta}(1+K_T)|\mathcal{F}_t]\big)e^{-\kappa T - \widetilde{A}_t}, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Letting $\theta \to 1$ yields that $Y_t - \widehat{Y}_t \le 0$, P-a.s. Then the continuity of processes Y and $\widehat{Y}$ proves the theorem. □

Using Theorem 4.1, Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2, we obtain the following uniqueness result for quadratic RBSDEs.

Corollary 5.1. *Let (ξ, f, L) be a parameter set such that f satisfies (H1)-(H3). If $\xi^+ \vee L_* \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then the quadratic RBSDE(ξ, f, L) admits a unique solution (Y, Z, K) in $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ that satisfies* (2.1).

Proof: The existence results from Theorem 4.1. Let $(\widehat{Y}, \widehat{Z}, \widehat{K})$ be another solution of the quadratic RBSDE(ξ, f, L) such that $(\widehat{Y}, \widehat{Z}, \widehat{K}) \in \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$. One can deduce from Theorem 5.1 or Theorem 5.2 that Y and $\widehat{Y}$ are indistinguishable, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= Y_0 - Y_t - (\widehat{Y}_0 - \widehat{Y}_t) = \int_0^t \big(f(s, Y_s, Z_s) - f(s, \widehat{Y}_s, \widehat{Z}_s)\big)\, ds + K_t - \widehat{K}_t - \int_0^t (Z_s - \widehat{Z}_s) dB_s \\ &= \int_0^t \big(f(s, Y_s, Z_s) - f(s, Y_s, \widehat{Z}_s)\big)\, ds + K_t - \widehat{K}_t - \int_0^t (Z_s - \widehat{Z}_s) dB_s\,, \quad t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Since the set of continuous martingales and that of finite variation processes only intersect at constants, one can deduce that $Z_t = \widehat{Z}_t$, $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. Putting it back into (5.20) shows that K and $\widehat{K}$ are indistinguishable. □

6 A Uniqueness Result

When the generator f is concave in z, we have the following more general uniqueness result than Corollary 5.1 by a Legendre-Fenchel transformation argument, which was used in [8], [9, Section 7] and [1, Section 4].

Theorem 6.1. *Let (ξ, f, L) be a parameter set such that f satisfies (H2) and is concave in z. Assume that for three constants $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that*

$$f(t, \omega, y, z) \ge -\alpha - \beta|y| - \frac{\gamma}{2}|z|^2, \qquad \forall\, (y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{6.1}$$

Then the RBSDE(ξ, f, L) has at most one solution $(Y, Z, K) \in \mathbb{E}^{\lambda,\lambda'}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ with $\lambda \in (\gamma, \infty)$ and $\lambda' \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof: Suppose that the RBSDE(ξ, f, L) has two solutions $\big\{(Y^i, Z^i, K^i)\big\}_{i=1,2} \subset \mathbb{E}^{\lambda_i,\lambda'_i}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ with $\lambda_i \in (\gamma, \infty)$ and $\lambda'_i \in (0,\infty)$. We set $\lambda \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2$ and $\lambda' \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lambda'_1 \wedge \lambda'_2$.

Clearly, $-f$ is convex in z. For any $(t, \omega, y) \in [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, it is well-known that the Legendre-Fenchel transformation of $f(t, \omega, y, \cdot)$:

$$\widehat{f}(t, \omega, y, \mathfrak{q}) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \big(\langle \mathfrak{q}, z\rangle + f(t, \omega, y, z)\big), \quad \forall\, \mathfrak{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

is an $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$-valued, convex and lower semicontinuous function. Let $\mathfrak{N}$ be the $dt \otimes dP$-null set except on which (5.1), (5.2) and (6.1) hold. Given $(t, \omega) \in \mathfrak{N}^c$, $\widehat{f}$ has the following properties:

(1) By (6.1), $\widehat{f}(t, \omega, y, \mathfrak{q}) \ge -\alpha - \beta|y| + \dfrac{1}{2\gamma}|\mathfrak{q}|^2$, $\forall\, (y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. (6.2)

(2) For any $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if $\widehat{f}(t, \omega, y, \mathfrak{q}) < \infty$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$, then (H2) implies that for any $y' \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\widehat{f}(t, \omega, y', \mathfrak{q}) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \big|\widehat{f}(t, \omega, y, \mathfrak{q}) - \widehat{f}(t, \omega, y', \mathfrak{q})\big| \le \kappa|y - y'|. \tag{6.3}$$

(3) For any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, since $-f(t, \omega, y, \cdot)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}^d$, the conjugacy relation shows that

$$-f(t, \omega, y, z) = \sup_{\mathfrak{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \big(\langle z, \mathfrak{q}\rangle - \widehat{f}(t, \omega, y, \mathfrak{q})\big), \quad \forall\, z \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{6.4}$$

Moreover, the convexity of $-f(t, \omega, y, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ implies its continuity on $\mathbb{R}^d$, thus

$$\widehat{f}(t, \omega, y, \mathfrak{q}) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{Q}^d} \big(\langle \mathfrak{q}, z\rangle + f(t, \omega, y, z)\big), \quad \forall\, \mathfrak{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

which implies that $\widehat{f}$ is $\mathscr{P} \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable.

(4) For any $(y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\partial(-f)(t,\omega,y,z)$ denote the subdifferential of the function $-f(t,\omega,y,\cdot)$ at z (see e.g. [24]). It is a non-empty convex compact subset of $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $-f(t,\omega,y,z') + f(t,\omega,y,z) \ge \langle \mathfrak{q}, z'-z \rangle$ for any $z' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, to wit,

$$\langle \mathfrak{q}, z \rangle + f(t,\omega,y,z) = \sup_{z' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \big(\langle \mathfrak{q}, z' \rangle + f(t,\omega,y,z') \big) = \widehat{f}(t,\omega,y,\mathfrak{q}). \tag{6.5}$$

Let $i = 1,2$. For any $(t,\omega) \in \mathfrak{N}^c$, we choose a $\mathfrak{q}^i(t,\omega) \in \partial(-f)\big(t,\omega,Y_t^i(\omega),Z_t^i(\omega)\big)$. By (6.5),

$$\widehat{f}\big(t,\omega,Y_t^i(\omega),\mathfrak{q}^i(t,\omega)\big) = \big\langle Z_t^i(\omega), \mathfrak{q}^i(t,\omega) \big\rangle + f\big(t,\omega,Y_t^i(\omega),Z_t^i(\omega)\big) < \infty. \tag{6.6}$$

Thanks to the Measurable Selection Theorem (see e.g. Lemma 1 of [3] or Lemma 16.34 of [11]), there exists an $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable process $\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i$ such that

$$f\big(t,\omega,Y_t^i(\omega),Z_t^i(\omega)\big) = \widehat{f}\big(t,\omega,Y_t^i(\omega),\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_t^i(\omega)\big) - \big\langle Z_t^i(\omega), \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_t^i(\omega) \big\rangle, \quad \forall\, (t,\omega) \in \mathfrak{N}^c, \tag{6.7}$$

which together with (6.2) leads to that

$$f\big(t,\omega,Y_t^i(\omega),Z_t^i(\omega)\big) \ge -\alpha - \beta|Y_t^i(\omega)| + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_t^i(\omega)\big|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Big(2\gamma\big|Z_t^i(\omega)\big|^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_t^i(\omega)\big|^2\Big), \quad \forall\, (t,\omega) \in \mathfrak{N}^c. \tag{6.8}$$

Since $(Y^i, Z^i, K^i) \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\lambda_i,\lambda'_i}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,loc}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ solves the RBSDE(ξ,f,L), it holds P-a.s. that

$$Y_*^i + \int_0^T \big|Z_t^i\big|^2 dt + \left| \int_0^T f\big(t,Y_t^i,Z_t^i\big)dt \right| < \infty.$$

Then it follows from (6.8) that

$$\frac{1}{4\gamma}\int_0^T \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_t^i\big|^2 dt \le \int_0^T f\big(t,Y_t^i,Z_t^i\big)dt + \big(\alpha+\beta Y_*^i\big)\,T + \gamma\int_0^T \big|Z_t^i\big|^2 dt < \infty, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{6.9}$$

Next, let us pick up an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{T}{N} \le \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{2\beta(\lambda+\lambda')}\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\lambda}\Big). \tag{6.10}$$

Let $t_0 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} 0$. For $j \in \{1,\cdots,N\}$, we set $t_j \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{jT}{N}$ and define the process

$$M_t^{i,j} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \exp\left(-\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{s \ge t_{j-1}\}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{s \ge t_{j-1}\}} \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i\big|^2 ds \right), \quad \forall\, t \in [0,t_j].$$

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the $\mathbf{F}$-stopping time

$$\tau_n^j \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \inf\left\{ t \in [t_{j-1},t_j] : \int_{t_{j-1}}^t \big(|Z_s^1|^2 + |Z_s^2|^2 + |\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^1|^2 + |\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^2|^2\big)ds > n \right\} \wedge t_j.$$

Clearly, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \uparrow \tau_n^j = t_j$, P-a.s. by (6.9), and $\Big\{M_{\tau_n^j \wedge t}^{i,j}\Big\}_{t \in [0,t_j]}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale thanks to Novikov's Criterion. Hence, $\dfrac{dQ_n^{i,j}}{dP} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} M_{\tau_n^j}^{i,j}$ induces a probability $Q_n^{i,j}$ that is equivalent to P. Girsanov Theorem shows that $\big\{B_t^{i,j,n} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} B_t + \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{t_{j-1} \le s \le \tau_n^j\}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i ds\big\}_{t \in [0,t_j]}$ is a Brownian Motion under $Q_n^{i,j}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[M_{\tau_n^j}^{i,j} \ln M_{\tau_n^j}^{i,j}\Big] &= E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\Big[\ln M_{\tau_n^j}^{i,j}\Big] = E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\left[-\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j} \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j} \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i\big|^2 ds \right] \\ &= E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\left[-\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j} \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i dB_s^{i,j,n} + \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j} |\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i|^2 ds \right] = \frac{1}{2} E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\left[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j} |\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}_s^i|^2 ds \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

It is well-known that for any $(x,\mu)\in\mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty)$

$$x\mu \le e^x+\mu(\ln\mu-1)\le e^x+\mu\ln\mu, \quad \text{thus} \quad x\mu=\lambda x\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\le e^{\lambda x}+\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\big(\ln\mu-\ln\lambda\big), \tag{6.12}$$

which together with (6.11) implies that for $k=1,2$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y_t^k\big)^-\bigg] &= E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y_t^k\big)^- M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}\bigg]\le E\Big[e^{\lambda (Y^k)^-_*}\Big]+\frac{1}{\lambda}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\Big[\ln M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}-\ln\lambda\Big]\\ &\le \widetilde{c}^{\,k}_\lambda+\frac{1}{2\lambda}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

where $\widetilde{c}^{\,k}_\lambda\triangleq E\Big[e^{\lambda(Y^k)^-_*}\Big]+\frac{(\ln\lambda)^-}{\lambda}$. Similarly,

$$E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y_t^k\big)^+\bigg]\le \widetilde{c}^{\,k}_{\lambda'}+\frac{1}{2\lambda'}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]. \tag{6.14}$$

We can deduce from (6.7), (6.2) and Girsanov Theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} Y^i_{t_{j-1}}-Y^i_{\tau_n^j} &= \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}f(s,Y^i_s,Z^i_s)ds+K^i_{\tau_n^j}-K^i_{t_{j-1}}-\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}Z^i_sdB_s\ge\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}\Big(\widehat{f}\big(s,Y^i_s,\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big)-\big\langle Z^i_s,\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big\rangle\Big)ds-\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}Z^i_sdB_s\\ &\ge \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}\Big(-\alpha-\beta\big|Y^i_s\big|+\frac{1}{2\gamma}\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big|^2\Big)ds-\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}Z^i_sdB^{i,j,n}_s, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

By Bayes' rule (see e.g., [12, Lemma 3.5.3]), $E_{Q_n^{i,j}}[Y^i_{t_{j-1}}]=E[Y^i_{t_{j-1}}M^{i,j}_{t_{j-1}}]=E[Y^i_{t_{j-1}}]$. Then taking $E_{Q_n^{i,j}}$ in (6.15), one can deduce from (6.13) and (6.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\gamma}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big|^2ds\bigg] &\le E\big[Y^i_{t_{j-1}}\big]+E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\Big[\Big(Y^i_{\tau_n^j}\Big)^-\Big]+\frac{\alpha T}{N}+\frac{\beta T}{N}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big|Y^i_t\big|\bigg]\\ &\le E\Big[\big(Y^i\big)^+_*\Big]+\frac{\alpha T}{N}+\Big(1+\frac{\beta T}{N}\Big)E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y^i_t\big)^-\bigg]+\frac{\beta T}{N}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y^i_t\big)^+\bigg]\\ &\le \Xi+\bigg(\frac{1}{2\lambda}+\frac{\beta T}{N}\Big(\frac{1}{2\lambda}+\frac{1}{2\lambda'}\Big)\bigg)E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg], \end{aligned}$$

where $\Xi\triangleq\frac{1}{\lambda'}E\Big[e^{\lambda'(Y^i)^+_*}\Big]+\frac{\alpha T}{N}+(1+\beta T)\widetilde{c}^{\,i}_\lambda+\beta T\widetilde{c}^{\,i}_{\lambda'}$. It follows from (6.11) and (6.10) that

$$\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}-\frac{1}{\lambda}\Big)E\Big[M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}\ln M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}\Big]=\frac{1}{4}\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}-\frac{1}{\lambda}\Big)E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big|^2ds\bigg]\le\Xi.$$

In light of de la Vallée-Poussin's lemma, $\big\{M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable. Hence, $E\Big[M^{i,j}_{t_j}\Big]=\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}E\Big[M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}\Big]=1$, which shows that $M^{i,j}$ is a martingale. Thus $\dfrac{dQ^{i,j}}{dP}\triangleq M^{i,j}_{t_j}$ induces a probability $Q^{i,j}$ that is equivalent to P, and $\big\{B^{i,j}_t\triangleq B_t+\int_0^t\mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t_{j-1}\}}\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_sds\big\}_{t\in[0,t_j]}$ is a Brownian Motion under $Q^{i,j}$. Then Fatou's lemma implies that

$$E_{Q^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]=E\bigg[M^{i,j}_{t_j}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]\le\varliminf_{n\to\infty}E\bigg[M^{i,j}_{\tau_n^j}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]=\varliminf_{n\to\infty}E_{Q_n^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau_n^j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]\le\frac{4\lambda\gamma\Xi}{\lambda-\gamma}.$$

And an analogy to (6.11) shows that

$$E_{Q^{i,j}}\Big[\ln M^{i,j}_{t_j}\Big]=\frac{1}{2}E_{Q^{i,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s|^2ds\bigg]\le\frac{2\lambda\gamma\Xi}{\lambda-\gamma}. \tag{6.16}$$

Now for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, applying Tanaka's formula to the process $\big(Y^1-Y^2\big)^+$, we can deduce from (6.4), (6.7), the flat-off condition of (Y^1,Z^1,K^1), (6.6), (6.3) as well as Girsanov Theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}\Big)^+ &= \Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j}\Big)^+ + \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}\big(f(s,Y^1_s,Z^1_s)-f(s,Y^2_s,Z^2_s)\big)ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}(dK^1_s-dK^2_s) - \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}(Z^1_s-Z^2_s)\,dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}d\mathfrak{L}_s \\ &\le \Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j}\Big)^+ + \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}\Big(\widehat{f}\big(s,Y^1_s,\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^2_s\big)-\big\langle Z^1_s,\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^2_s\big\rangle-\widehat{f}\big(s,Y^2_s,\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^2_s\big)+\big\langle Z^2_s,\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^2_s\big\rangle\Big)ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{L_s=Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}dK^1_s - \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}(Z^1_s-Z^2_s)\,dB_s \\ &\le \Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j}\Big)^+ + \kappa\int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}\big(Y^1_s-Y^2_s\big)^+ds - \int_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}^{\tau^n_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}(Z^1_s-Z^2_s)\,dB^{2,j}_s,\quad t\in[t_{j-1},t_j],\end{aligned}\tag{6.17}$$

where $\mathfrak{L}$ is a real-valued, $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, increasing and continuous process known as "local time". Taking the expectation $E_{Q^{2,j}}$ and using Fubini Theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}\Big)^+\bigg] &\le E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j}\Big)^+\bigg] + \kappa E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\int_t^{t_j}\mathbf{1}_{\{s\le\tau^n_j\}}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y^1_s>Y^2_s\}}\Big(Y^1_s-Y^2_s\Big)^+ds\bigg] \\ &\le E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j}\Big)^+\bigg] + \kappa\int_t^{t_j}E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\Big(Y^1_s-Y^2_s\Big)^+\bigg]ds,\quad t\in[t_{j-1},t_j].\end{aligned}$$

Then an application of Gronwall's inequality yields that

$$E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j\wedge t}\Big)^+\bigg]\le e^{\kappa T}E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\Big(Y^1_{\tau^n_j}-Y^2_{\tau^n_j}\Big)^+\bigg],\quad t\in[t_{j-1},t_j].\tag{6.18}$$

Similar to (6.13) and (6.14), one can deduce from (6.12) and (6.16) that

$$E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\Big(Y^1_t-Y^2_t\Big)^+\bigg]\le E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y^1_t\big)^+ + \sup_{t\in[0,t_j]}\big(Y^2_t\big)^-\bigg]\le \widetilde{c}^{\,1}_{\lambda'}+\widetilde{c}^{\,2}_{\lambda}+\Big(\frac{1}{2\lambda'}+\frac{1}{2\lambda}\Big)E_{Q^{2,j}}\bigg[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^2_s|^2ds\bigg]<\infty.$$

If $Y^1_{t_j}\le Y^2_{t_j}$, P-a.s., as $n\to\infty$ in (6.18), Dominated convergence theorem implies that for any $t\in[t_{j-1},t_j]$

$$E_{Q^{2,j}}\Big[\big(Y^1_t-Y^2_t\big)^+\Big]=0,\quad \text{thus}\quad Y^1_t\le Y^2_t,\quad P\text{-a.s.}\tag{6.19}$$

In particular, $Y^1_{t_{j-1}}\le Y^2_{t_{j-1}}$, P-a.s. On the other hand, if $Y^2_{t_j}\le Y^1_{t_j}$, P-a.s., interchanging (Y^1,Z^1,Z^1) with (Y^2,Z^2,Z^2) and estimating under $Q^{1,j}$ in the above arguments $\big($from (6.17) to (6.19)$\big)$ give that for any $t\in[t_{j-1},t_j]$, $Y^2_t\le Y^1_t$, P-a.s. Therefore, starting from $Y^1_T=Y^2_T=\xi$, P-a.s., we can use backward induction to conclude that for any $t\in[0,T]$, $Y^1_t=Y^2_t$, P-a.s. Then the continuity of processes Y^1 and Y^2 shows that Y^1 and Y^2 are indistinguishable. Similar to the proof of Corollary 5.1, it follows that $Z^1_t=Z^2_t$, $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. as well as that K^1 and K^2 are indistinguishable. □

Remark 6.1. *This uniqueness result via Legendre-Fenchel transformation may not work for the convex-generator case: In fact, if the generator f is convex in the z-variable $\big($while requiring that it holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that $f(t,y,z)\le\alpha+\beta|y|+\frac{\gamma}{2}|z|^2$, $\forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\big)$, we have to alternatively define*

$$\widehat{f}(t,\omega,y,\mathfrak{q})\overset{\triangle}{=}\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d}\big(\langle\mathfrak{q},z\rangle-f(t,\omega,y,z)\big),\quad \forall\,(t,\omega,y,\mathfrak{q})\in[0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d.$$

Correspondingly, equation (6.15) *becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} Y^i_{t_{j-1}} - Y^i_{\tau^j_n} &= \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} f(s, Y^i_s, Z^i_s)ds + K^i_{\tau^j_n} - K^i_{t_{j-1}} - \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} Z^i_s dB_s \\ &= \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} \Big(\langle Z^i_s, \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s \rangle - \widehat{f}\big(s, Y^i_s, \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big) \Big) ds + K^i_{\tau^j_n} - K^i_{t_{j-1}} - \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} Z^i_s dB_s \\ &\le \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} \Big(\alpha + \beta \big|Y^i_s\big| - \frac{1}{2\gamma} \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big|^2 \Big) ds + K^i_{\tau^j_n} - K^i_{t_{j-1}} - \int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} Z^i_s d\widetilde{B}^{i,j,n}_s, \quad P\text{-a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\big\{\widetilde{B}^{i,j,n}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} B_t - \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{t_{j-1} \le s \le \tau^j_n\}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s ds\big\}_{t\in[0,t_j]}$ *is a Brownian Motion under the probability* $\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n$*, which is induced by* $\frac{d\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n}{dP} \overset{\triangle}{=} \exp\Big(\int_0^{\tau^j_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{s \ge t_{j-1}\}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau^j_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{s \ge t_{j-1}\}} \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big|^2 ds\Big)$*. Hence,* $E_{\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n}\Big[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} \big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{q}}^i_s\big|^2 ds\Big]$ *also depends on* $E_{\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n}\Big[K^i_{\tau^j_n} - K^i_{t_{j-1}}\Big]$*, which in turn depends on* $E_{\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n}\Big[\sup\limits_{s\in[t_{j-1},t_j]} \big|Y^i_s\big|\Big]$ *and* $E_{\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n}\Big[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} |Z^i_s|^2 ds\Big]$ *due to the the structure of the quadratic RBSDE. If we estimate* $E_{\widetilde{Q}^{i,j}_n}\Big[\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} |Z^i_s|^2 ds\Big]$ *similar to* (6.13)*, then* $E\Big[\exp\big\{\widetilde{\lambda}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{\tau^j_n} |Z^i_s|^2 ds\big\}\Big]$ *is supposed to be uniformly bounded in* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *for some* $\widetilde{\lambda} > 0$*. To wit,* $E\Big[\exp\big\{\widetilde{\lambda}\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} |Z^i_s|^2 ds\big\}\Big] < \infty$*. However,* $\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} |Z^i_s|^2 ds$ *may not even in* $\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_{t_j})$ *for* $p \ge \frac{\lambda\lambda'}{\lambda+\lambda'}$ *according to Proposition 2.2.*

7 An Optimal Stopping Problem for Quadratic g-Evaluations

In this section, we will solve an optimal stopping problem in which the objective of the stopper is to determine an optimal stopping time τ_* that satisfies

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{S}_{0,T}} \mathcal{E}^g_{0,\tau}\big[\mathcal{R}_\tau\big] = \mathcal{E}^g_{0,\tau_*}\big[\mathcal{R}_{\tau_*}\big], \tag{7.1}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^g$ is a "quadratic g-evaluation" (a type of non-linear expectation to be defined below), and $\mathcal{R}$ is a reward process that we will specify shortly.

Let $g : [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable function that satisfies (H1)-(H3). For any $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$, It is clear that $g_\tau(t,\omega,y,z) \overset{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\tau\}} g(t,\omega,y,z)$, $(t,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$ is also a $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable function that satisfies (H1)-(H3). Thus, we know from Corollary 6 of [5] that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$, the following quadratic BSDE

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau\}} g(s, Y_s, Z_s)ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, \qquad t \in [0,T] \tag{7.2}$$

admits a unique solution $(Y^{\tau,\xi}, Z^{\tau,\xi})$ in $\bigcap\limits_{p\in(1,\infty)} \mathbb{E}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, if $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$, one can deduce that

$$P\Big(Y^{\tau,\xi}_t = Y^{\tau,\xi}_{\tau\wedge t},\ \forall\, t \in [0,T]\Big) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Z^{\tau,\xi}_t = \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\tau\}} Z^{\tau,\xi}_t, \quad dt\otimes dP\text{-a.e.} \tag{7.3}$$

Definition 7.1. *A "quadratic* g*-evaluation" with domain* $\mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$ *is a family of operators* $\big\{\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau} : \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau) \mapsto \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\nu)\big\}_{\nu\in\mathcal{S}_{0,T},\tau\in\mathcal{S}_{\nu,T}}$ *such that* $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi] \overset{\triangle}{=} Y^{\tau,\xi}_\nu$, $\forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$*. In particular, for any* $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$*, we can define the "quadratic* g*-expectation" of* ξ *at a stopping time* $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$ *by* $\mathcal{E}^g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_\nu] \overset{\triangle}{=} \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,T}[\xi]$.

The g-evaluation was introduced by [23] for Lipschitz generators over $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then [18] extended the notion for quadratic generators, however, on $\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Thanks to Theorem 5 of [5] and the uniqueness of the solution $(Y^{\tau,\xi}, Z^{\tau,\xi})$, the quadratic g-evaluation $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}$ introduced in Definition 7.1 has the following properties:

(1) *"Monotonicity":* For any $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ with $\xi \ge \eta$, P-a.s., we have $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi] \ge \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\eta]$, P-a.s.;

(2) *"Time-Consistency":* For any $\nu_1, \nu_2, \tau \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$ with $\nu_1 \le \nu_2 \le \tau$, P-a.s., and for any $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$, we have $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu_1,\nu_2}\big[\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu_2,\tau}[\xi]\big] = \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu_1,\tau}[\xi]$, P-a.s.;

(3) *"Constant-Preserving":* If it holds $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. that $g(t,y,0) = 0$, $\forall\, y \in \mathbb{R}$, then for any $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\nu)$, we have $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi] = \xi$, P-a.s.;

(4) *"Zero-one Law":* For any $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_\nu$, we have $\mathbf{1}_A \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\mathbf{1}_A \xi] = \mathbf{1}_A \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi]$, P-a.s.. Moreover, if $g(t,0,0) = 0$, $dt \otimes dP$-a.e., then $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\mathbf{1}_A \xi] = \mathbf{1}_A \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi]$, P-a.s.;

(5) *"Translation Invariance":* If g is independent of y, then for any $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_\nu)$, we have $\mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi + \eta] = \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\xi] + \eta$, P-a.s.

Now, we assume that the reward process $\mathcal{R}$ is in the form of

$$\mathcal{R}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{t<T\}} \mathcal{L}_t + \mathbf{1}_{\{t=T\}} \xi, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{7.4}$$

for some $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ with $\mathcal{L}_T \le \xi$, P-a.s. One can regard $\mathcal{L}$ as the running reward and ξ as the final reward with a possible bonus.

When $\xi^+ \vee \mathcal{L}_* \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$, the quadratic RBSDE $(\xi, g, \mathcal{L})$ admits a unique solution $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{K})$ in $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ thanks to Corollary 5.1. In fact, the continuous process $\mathcal{Y}$ is the snell envelope of the reward process $\mathcal{R}$ under the quadratic g-evaluation, and the first time process $\mathcal{Y}$ meets process $\mathcal{R}$ after time $t = 0$ is an optimal stopping time for (7.1). More precisely, we have the following result.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $g : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathscr{P} \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable function that satisfies (H1)-(H3), and let $\mathcal{R}$ be a reward process in the form of (7.4). If $\xi^+ \vee \mathcal{L}_* \in \mathbb{L}^e(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then for any $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$,*

$$\mathcal{Y}_\nu = \underset{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\nu,T}}{\operatorname{esssup}}\, \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}\big[\mathcal{R}_\tau\big] = \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau_*(\nu)}\big[\mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)}\big], \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

where $\mathcal{Y}$ is the first component of the unique solution to the quadratic RBSDE$(\xi, g, \mathcal{L})$ and $\tau_*(\nu) \overset{\triangle}{=} \inf\big\{t \in [\nu, T] : \mathcal{Y}_t = \mathcal{R}_t\big\} \in \mathcal{S}_{\nu,T}$.

This theorem extends Section 3 of [20], it also extends Theorem 5.3 of [2] except that the continuity condition on the reward process $\mathcal{R}$ is strengthened. The proof of Theorem 7.1 depends on the following two comparison theorems for quadratic BSDEs, which generalize Theorem 5 of [5].

Proposition 7.1. *Let $f, \hat{f} : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be two $\mathscr{P} \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable functions, and let $(Y, Z, V), (\widehat{Y}, \widehat{Z}, \widehat{V}) \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T] \times \widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ solve the following two BSDEs*

$$Y_t = Y_T + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s)\, ds + V_T - V_t - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s\,, \qquad t \in [0,T] \tag{7.5}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad \widehat{Y}_t = \widehat{Y}_T + \int_t^T \hat{f}(s, \widehat{Y}_s, \widehat{Z}_s)\, ds + \widehat{V}_T - \widehat{V}_t - \int_t^T \widehat{Z}_s dB_s\,, \qquad t \in [0,T] \tag{7.6}$$

respectively such that $Y_T \le \widehat{Y}_T$, P-a.s., that

$$E\Big[e^{\lambda Y_*^+} + e^{\lambda \widehat{Y}_*^-}\Big] < \infty, \quad \forall\, \lambda \in (1, \infty), \tag{7.7}$$

and that for some $\theta_0 \in (0,1)$, $V - \theta \widehat{V}$ is a decreasing process for any $\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)$. If either of the following two holds:

(i) f satisfies (H1'), (H2); f is convex in z; and $\Delta f(t) \overset{\triangle}{=} f(t, \widehat{Y}_t, \widehat{Z}_t) - \hat{f}(t, \widehat{Y}_t, \widehat{Z}_t) \le 0$, $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.;

(ii) $\hat{f}$ satisfies (H1'), (H2); $\hat{f}$ is convex in z; and $\Delta f(t) \overset{\triangle}{=} f(t, Y_t, Z_t) - \hat{f}(t, Y_t, Z_t) \le 0$, $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.;

(where (H1') is an extension of (H1) in that the constant α is replaced by an $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable, non-negative process $\{\alpha_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ such that $E\big[\exp\big\{p \int_0^T \alpha_r dr\big\}\big] < \infty$ for some $p > \gamma e^{2\kappa T}$) then it holds P-a.s. that $Y_t \le \widehat{Y}_t$ for any $t \in [0,T]$.

In addition, if $Y_\tau = \widehat{Y}_\tau$*,* P*-a.s. for some* $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$*, then*

$$P\left(Y_T = \widehat{Y}_T, \int_\tau^T \Delta f(s)ds = 0\right) > 0. \tag{7.8}$$

Proof: For any $\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)$, we set $U \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Y - \theta\widehat{Y}$, $\Upsilon \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Z - \theta\widehat{Z}$ and still define the $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable process $\{a_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ as in (5.3). It follows that $A_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \int_0^t a_s\,ds$, $t \in [0,T]$ is an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted process with $A_* \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]} |A_t| \le \int_0^T |a_s|ds \le \kappa T$, P-a.s. Similar to (5.4), (H1) and the convexity of $\mathfrak{F}$ in z show that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\mathfrak{F}(t,y,Z_t) \le \theta\mathfrak{F}\big(t,y,\widehat{Z}_t\big) + (1-\theta)\big(\alpha_t + \beta|y|\big) + \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|\Upsilon_t|^2, \quad \forall\, y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{7.9}$$

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we still define the $\mathbf{F}$-stopping time (5.5). Let $\zeta_\theta \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}$. Applying Itô's formula to the process $\Gamma_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \exp\big\{\zeta_\theta e^{A_t} U_t\big\}$, $t \in [0,T]$, yields that

$$\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t} = \Gamma_{\tau_n} + \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} G_s ds + \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \Gamma_s e^{A_s}\big(dV_s - \theta d\widehat{V}_s\big) - \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} \Gamma_s e^{A_s}\Upsilon_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where $G_t = \zeta_\theta \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Big(f(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \theta\hat{f}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t) - a_t U_t - \frac{1}{2}\zeta_\theta e^{A_t}|\Upsilon_t|^2\Big)$. Let $\Delta_\theta f(t) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \theta\Delta f(t)$ if (i) holds and $\Delta_\theta f(t) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Delta f(t)$ if (ii) holds for $t \in [0,T]$. Then

$$G_t = \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\left(\Delta_\theta f(t) + \mathfrak{F}(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \theta\mathfrak{F}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t) - a_t U_t - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|\Upsilon_t|^2\right), \quad t \in [0,T]$$

whether (i) or (ii) holds. Similar to (5.7), using (7.9) and (H2), one can show by 3 cases that

$$G_t \le \zeta_\theta\, \Gamma_t e^{A_t}\Delta_\theta f(t) + \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\,\Gamma_t\Big(\alpha_t + (\beta+\kappa)\big(Y_t^+ + \widehat{Y}_t^-\big)\Big), \quad dt \otimes dP\text{-a.e.} \tag{7.10}$$

Now, we define a process

$$D_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \exp\left\{\zeta_\theta \int_0^t e^{A_s}\Delta_\theta f(s)ds + \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_0^t \Big(\alpha_t + (\beta+\kappa)\big(Y_s^+ + \widehat{Y}_s^-\big)\Big)ds\right\}, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Then it holds P-a.s. that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D_s}{D_t} &= \exp\left\{\zeta_\theta \int_t^s e^{A_r}\Delta_\theta f(r)dr + \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_t^s \Big(\alpha_r + (\beta+\kappa)\big(Y_r^+ + \widehat{Y}_r^-\big)\Big)dr\right\} \\ &\le \exp\left\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\bigg(\int_0^T \alpha_r dr + (\beta+\kappa)T\big(Y_*^+ + \widehat{Y}_*^-\big)\bigg)\right\} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \eta, \quad \forall\, 0 \le s \le t \le T. \end{aligned}$$

As $D_0 = 1$, we in particular have $D_* \le \eta$, P-a.s. Let $q = \frac{p}{\gamma}e^{-2\kappa T}$ and $\widetilde{\eta} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \eta\exp\big\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+\big\}$. Hölder's inequality and (7.7) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} E\big[D_*\Gamma_*\big] &\le E\big[\eta\Gamma_*\big] \le E\bigg[\exp\bigg\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_0^T \alpha_r dr + \big((\beta+\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T} + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big)\big(Y_*^+ + \widehat{Y}_*^-\big)\bigg\}\bigg] \\ &\le \bigg\|\exp\bigg\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_0^T \alpha_r dr\bigg\}\bigg\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(\mathcal{F}_T)} \bigg\|\exp\Big\{\big((\beta+\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T} + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big)\big(Y_*^+ + \widehat{Y}_*^-\big)\Big\}\bigg\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\frac{q}{q-1}}(\mathcal{F}_T)} < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

and that

$$E\big[\widetilde{\eta}\big] \le \bigg\|\exp\bigg\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_0^T \alpha_r dr\bigg\}\bigg\|_{\mathbb{L}^q(\mathcal{F}_T)} \bigg\|\exp\Big\{(\beta+\kappa)\gamma T e^{2\kappa T}\widehat{Y}_*^- + \big(1 + (\beta+\kappa)T\big)\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+\Big\}\bigg\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\frac{q}{q-1}}(\mathcal{F}_T)} < \infty. \tag{7.12}$$

Fix $t \in [0,T]$. Integration by parts and (7.10) imply that P-a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\tau_n\wedge t}\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t} &\le D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n} + \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}\big(dV_s - \theta d\widehat{V}_s\big) - \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}\Upsilon_s dB_s \\ &\le D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n} - \zeta_\theta \int_{\tau_n\wedge t}^{\tau_n} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}\Upsilon_s dB_s. \end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

Similar to (5.13), the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and (7.11) show that $\int_0^{\tau_n\wedge\cdot} D_s\Gamma_s e^{A_s}\Upsilon_s dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale.

Taking $E\big[\,\cdot\,\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big]$ in (7.13), we see from (7.11) that

$$D_{\tau_n\wedge t}\Gamma_{\tau_n\wedge t} \;\le\; E\big[D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n}\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n\wedge t}\big] = \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n<t\}}D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n\ge t\}}E\big[D_{\tau_n}\Gamma_{\tau_n}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big], \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Let $\Delta Y_T \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Y_T - \widehat{Y}_T$. As $n\to\infty$, Dominated Convergence Theorem, (7.11) and (7.12) imply that

$$D_t\Gamma_t \le E\big[D_T\Gamma_T\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big] \le E\big[D_T \exp\big\{\theta\zeta_\theta\, e^{A_T}\Delta Y_T + \gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_T^+\big\}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big], \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{7.14}$$

Then it follows from (7.12) that P-a.s.

$$\Gamma_t \le E\bigg[\frac{D_T}{D_t}\exp\big\{\theta\zeta_\theta\, e^{A_T}\Delta Y_T + \gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+\big\}\bigg|\mathcal{F}_t\bigg] \le E\Big[\eta\exp\big\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+\big\}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] = E\big[\widetilde{\eta}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big],$$

which leads to that

$$Y_t - \theta\widehat{Y}_t \le \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln E\big[\widetilde{\eta}\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big]e^{-\kappa T - A_t}, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Letting $\theta\to 1$ yields that $Y_t - \widehat{Y}_t \le 0$, P-a.s. Then the continuity of processes Y and $\widehat{Y}$ shows that $P\big(Y_t \le \widehat{Y}_t,\ \forall\, t\in[0,T]\big) = 1$.

In addition, suppose that $Y_\tau = \widehat{Y}_\tau$, P-a.s. for some $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$, however that (7.8) does not hold $\big($i.e., $\Delta Y_T + \int_\tau^T \Delta f(s)ds < 0$, P-a.s.$\big)$. Letting $\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)$ and taking $t=\tau$ in (7.14) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;&<\; \exp\big\{\gamma e^{\kappa T + A_\tau}Y_\tau\big\} = \Gamma_\tau \le E\bigg[\frac{D_T}{D_\tau}\exp\big\{\theta\zeta_\theta\, e^{A_T}\Delta Y_T + \gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^+\big\}\bigg|\,\mathcal{F}_\tau\bigg] \\ &\le\; E\bigg[\widetilde{\eta}\exp\Big\{\zeta_\theta\, e^{-\kappa T}\Big(\theta\Delta Y_T + \int_\tau^T \Delta_\theta f(s)ds\Big)\Big\}\bigg|\,\mathcal{F}_\tau\bigg], \quad P\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

As $\theta\to 1$, Dominated Convergence Theorem and (7.12) imply that

$$0 < \exp\big\{\gamma e^{\kappa T + A_\tau}Y_\tau\big\} \le \lim_{\theta\to 1}\!\downarrow E\bigg[\widetilde{\eta}\exp\Big\{\zeta_\theta\, e^{-\kappa T}\Big(\theta\Delta Y_T + \int_\tau^T \Delta_\theta f(s)ds\Big)\Big\}\bigg|\,\mathcal{F}_\tau\bigg] = 0, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

A contradiction appears. □

Proposition 7.2. *Let $f, \hat{f} : [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be two $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable functions, and let $(Y,Z,V), (\widehat{Y},\widehat{Z},\widehat{V}) \in \mathbb{C}^0_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]\times\widehat{\mathbb{H}}^{2,loc}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ solve the BSDEs (7.5) and BSDEs (7.6) respectively such that $Y_T \le \widehat{Y}_T$, P-a.s., that (7.7) holds, and that for some $\theta_0 \in (0,1)$, $\theta V - \widehat{V}$ is a decreasing process for any $\theta\in(\theta_0,1)$. If either of the following two holds:*

$(\,i)$ f satisfies (H1'), (H2); f is concave in z; and $\Delta f(t) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} f(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t) - \hat{f}(t,\widehat{Y}_t,\widehat{Z}_t) \le 0$, $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.;

(ii) $\hat{f}$ satisfies (H1'), (H2); $\hat{f}$ is concave in z; and $\Delta f(t) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} f(t,Y_t,Z_t) - \hat{f}(t,Y_t,Z_t) \le 0$, $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.;

then it holds P-a.s. that $Y_t \le \widehat{Y}_t$ for any $t\in[0,T]$. In addition, if $Y_\tau = \widehat{Y}_\tau$, P-a.s. for some $\tau\in\mathcal{S}_{0,T}$, then (7.8) holds.

Proof: The triplet $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{V}) \triangleq \big(-\widehat{Y},-\widehat{Z},-\widehat{V}\big)$ solves the BSDE(7.5) with generator $\mathfrak{f}(t,\omega,y,z) \triangleq -\hat{f}(t,\omega,-y,-z)$, $\forall\,(t,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$, and triplet $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{Y}},\widehat{\mathcal{Z}},\widehat{\mathcal{V}}\big) \triangleq (-Y,-Z,-V)$ solves the BSDE(7.6) with generator $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}(t,\omega,y,z) \triangleq -f(t,\omega,-y,-z)$, $\forall\,(t,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$. One can check that all conditions in Proposition 7.1 are satisfied by the new settings. Therefore, an application of Proposition 7.1 gives rise to the conclusion. □

Proof of Theorem 7.1 : Fix $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_{0,T}$. For any $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\nu,T}$, it holds P-a.s. that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}_{\tau\wedge t} &= \mathcal{Y}_\tau + \int_{\tau\wedge t}^{\tau} g\big(s,\mathcal{Y}_s,\mathcal{Z}_s\big)ds + \mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau\wedge t} - \int_{\tau\wedge t}^{\tau} \mathcal{Z}_s dB_s \\
&= \mathcal{Y}_\tau + \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau\}} g\big(s,\mathcal{Y}_{\tau\wedge s},\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau\}}\mathcal{Z}_s\big)ds + \mathcal{K}_\tau - \mathcal{K}_{\tau\wedge t} - \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau\}}\mathcal{Z}_s dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T]. \qquad (7.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{Y}_\tau \ge \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<T\}}\mathcal{L}_\tau + \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}}\xi = \mathcal{R}_\tau$, P-a.s., applying Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2 with $(Y,Z,V) = \big(Y^{\tau,\mathcal{R}_\tau},Z^{\tau,\mathcal{R}_\tau},0\big)$ and $\big(\widehat{Y},\widehat{Z},\widehat{V}\big) = \big\{\big(\mathcal{Y}_{\tau\wedge t},\mathbf{1}_{\{t<\tau\}}\mathcal{Z}_t,\mathcal{K}_{\tau\wedge t}\big)\big\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ yields that P-a.s.

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\tau\wedge t} \ge Y_t^{\tau,\mathcal{R}_\tau}, \quad t\in[0,T].$$

In particular, we have $\mathcal{Y}_\nu \ge Y_\nu^{\tau,\mathcal{R}_\tau} = \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau}[\mathcal{R}_\tau]$, P-a.s.

So it remains to show that $\mathcal{Y}_\nu = \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau_*(\nu)}\big[\mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)}\big]$, P-a.s. To see this, we define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_t \triangleq \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}Y_t^{\nu,\mathcal{Y}_\nu} + \mathbf{1}_{\{t\ge\nu\}}\mathcal{Y}_{\tau_*(\nu)\wedge t} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_t \triangleq \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}Z_t^{\nu,\mathcal{Y}_\nu} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\nu\le t<\tau_*(\nu)\}}\mathcal{Z}_t, \quad \forall\,t\in[0,T].$$

Clearly, $\big(\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}},\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}\big) \in \underset{p\in(1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{E}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]\times\mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. The flat-off condition of $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{K})$ and the continuity of $\mathcal{K}$ imply that P-a.s.

$$0 = \int_{[\nu,\tau_*(\nu))} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{Y}_s>\mathcal{L}_s\}}d\mathcal{K}_s = \int_{[\nu,\tau_*(\nu))} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{Y}_s>\mathcal{R}_s\}}d\mathcal{K}_s = \int_{[\nu,\tau_*(\nu))} d\mathcal{K}_s = \lim_{s\nearrow\tau_*(\nu)} \mathcal{K}_s - \mathcal{K}_\nu = \mathcal{K}_{\tau_*(\nu)} - \mathcal{K}_\nu.$$

Hence, taking $\tau=\tau_*(\nu)$ and $t=\nu\vee t$ in (7.15), we can deduce that P-a.s.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}_{(\nu\vee t)\wedge\tau_*(\nu)} &= \mathcal{Y}_{\tau_*(\nu)} + \int_{\nu\vee t}^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}} g\big(s,\mathcal{Y}_{\tau_*(\nu)\wedge s},\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}}\mathcal{Z}_s\big)ds - \int_{\nu\vee t}^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}}\mathcal{Z}_s dB_s \\
&= \mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)} + \int_{\nu\vee t}^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}} g\big(s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s\big)ds - \int_{\nu\vee t}^T \widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T]. \qquad (7.16)
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{Y}_\nu = \mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)} + \int_\nu^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}} g\big(s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s\big)ds - \int_\nu^T \widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s dB_s, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \qquad (7.17)$$

Fix $t\in[0,T]$. One can deduce from (7.3) and (7.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}Y_t^{\nu,\mathcal{Y}_\nu} &= \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\mathcal{Y}_\nu + \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\int_t^\nu g\Big(s,Y_s^{\nu,\mathcal{Y}_\nu},Z_s^{\nu,\mathcal{Y}_\nu}\Big)ds - \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\int_t^\nu Z_s^{\nu,\mathcal{Y}_\nu}dB_s \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\mathcal{Y}_\nu + \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\int_t^\nu g\big(s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s\big)ds - \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\int_t^\nu \widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s dB_s \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)} + \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}} g\big(s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s\big)ds - \mathbf{1}_{\{t<\nu\}}\int_t^T \widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s dB_s,
\end{aligned}$$

which together with (7.16) implies that P-a.s.

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_t = \mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)} + \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\tau_*(\nu)\}} g\big(s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_s,\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s\big)ds - \int_t^T \widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}_s dB_s. \qquad (7.18)$$

The continuity of process $\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_t$ further shows that P-a.s., (7.18) holds for any $t\in[0,T]$. To wit, $(\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}},\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}) \in \underset{p\in(1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{E}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]\times\mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the unique solution of the BSDE (7.2) with $(\tau,\xi) = \big(\tau_*(\nu),\mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)}\big)$. Therefore, it follows that $\mathcal{Y}_\nu = \widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\nu = \mathcal{E}^g_{\nu,\tau_*(\nu)}\big[\mathcal{R}_{\tau_*(\nu)}\big]$. □

8 Stability

Theorem 8.1. *Let* $\{(\xi_m, f_m, L^m)\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *be a sequence of parameter sets such that*

(S1) With the same constants $\alpha, \beta, \kappa \ge 0$ *and* $\gamma > 0$, f_0 *satisfies (H1) and* $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *satisfy (H1)-(H3);*

(S2) It holds P*-a.s. that* ξ_n *converges to* ξ_0 *and that* L^n_t *converges to* L^0_t *uniformly in* $t \in [0,T]$*;*

(S3) $\Xi(p) \triangleq \sup\limits_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} E\Big[e^{p\,(\xi^+_m \vee L^m_*)}\Big] < \infty$ *for all* $p \in (1,\infty)$.

We let $(Y^0, Z^0, K^0) \in \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ *be a solution of the quadratic RBSDE*(ξ_0, f_0, L^0) *, and for any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *we let* (Y^n, Z^n, K^n) *be the unique solution of the quadratic RBSDE*(ξ_n, f_n, L^n) *in* $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. *If* $f_n\big(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t\big)$ *converges* $dt \otimes dP$*-a.e. to* $f_0\big(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t\big)$*, then for any* $p \in [1,\infty)$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\bigg[\exp\bigg\{p\cdot\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y^n_t - Y^0_t|\bigg\}\bigg] = 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T |Z^n_s - Z^0_s|^2 ds\bigg)^p\bigg] = 0.$$

Moreover, if it holds $dt \otimes dP$*-a.e. that* $f_n(t,\omega,y,z)$ *converges to* $f_0(t,\omega,y,z)$ *locally uniformly in* (y,z)*, then up to a subsequence, we further have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\Big[\big|K^n_T - K^0_T\big|^p\Big] = 0, \quad \forall\, p \in [1,\infty). \tag{8.1}$$

In (S1) of Theorem 8.1, the convexity/concavity does not need to be the same for all generators $f'_n s$, for example, it can be alternate as in the following example.

Example 8.1. *Let* $d = 1$. *For any* $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$*, the function*

$$f_m(t,\omega,y,z) \triangleq (-1)^m z^2, \quad \forall\,(t,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$$

is $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$*-measurable and satisfies (H1), (H2) with* $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\kappa) = (0,0,2,0)$. *Moreover,* f_m *is convex (resp. concave) in* z *when* m *is even (resp. odd). Clearly,* $(0,0,0)$ *is the unique solution of RBSDE*$(0, f_0, 0)$ *in* $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. *For any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *we set* $L^n_t \triangleq \frac{T-t}{n}$, $t \in [0,T]$*, and let* (Y^n, Z^n, K^n) *be the unique solution of the quadratic RBSDE*$(0, f_n, L^n)$ *in* $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. *As* $f_m(\cdot,\cdot,0,0) \equiv 0$ *for all* $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$*, the first part of Theorem 8.1 yields that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\Big[e^{pY^n_*}\Big] = 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T |Z^n_s|^2 ds\bigg)^p\bigg] = 0, \quad \forall\, p \in [1,\infty).$$

Proof of Theorem 8.1: 1) Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta \in (0,1)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. We first show that P-a.s.

$$|Y^n_t - Y^0_t| \le (1-\theta)\big(|Y^0_t| + |Y^n_t|\big) + \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^4 I^{n,i}_t\right), \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{8.2}$$

where $I^{n,i}_t \triangleq E\Big[I^{n,i}_T\big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big]$ for $i = 1,2,3,4$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{n,1}_T &\triangleq D_T\eta_n \ \text{ with } D_t \triangleq \exp\bigg\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\int_0^t \big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)|Y^0_s|\big)ds\bigg\}, \ t \in [0,T] \ \text{and} \\
&\qquad \eta_n \triangleq \exp\Big\{\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big(|\xi_n - \theta\xi_0| \vee |\xi_0 - \theta\xi_n|\big)\Big\}; \\
I^{n,2}_T &\triangleq \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} D_T \Upsilon_n \int_0^T \big|\Delta_n f(s)\big|ds \ \text{ with } \zeta_\theta \triangleq \frac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}, \ \Upsilon_n \triangleq \exp\Big\{\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big(Y^n_* + Y^0_*\big)\Big\} \ \text{and} \\
&\qquad \Delta_n f(t) \triangleq f_n\big(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t\big) - f_0\big(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t\big), \ t \in [0,T]; \\
I^{n,3}_T &\triangleq \Big(1 + \zeta_\theta \exp\big\{\kappa T + \varepsilon\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big\}\Big)\Big(1 + D_T \exp\big\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}\big(Y^0_* + Y^n_*\big)\big\}\big(K^0_T + K^n_T\big)\Big); \\
I^{n,4}_T &\triangleq \frac{\zeta_\theta}{\varepsilon} e^{\kappa T} D_T \Upsilon_n \Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|L^n_t - L^0_t|\Big)\big(K^0_T + K^n_T\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 1: f_n is convex in z. We set $U^n \overset{\triangle}{=} Y^n - \theta Y^0$, $V^n \overset{\triangle}{=} Z^n - \theta Z^0$ and define two processes

$$a^n_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{U^n_t \neq 0\}} \frac{f_n(t, Y^n_t, Z^n_t) - f_n(t, \theta Y^0_t, Z^n_t)}{U^n_t} - \kappa \mathbf{1}_{\{U^n_t = 0\}}, \quad A^n_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \int_0^t a^n_s ds, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Applying Itô's formula to the process $\Gamma^{1,n}_t \overset{\triangle}{=} \exp\big\{\zeta_\theta e^{A^n_t} U^n_t\big\}$, $t \in [0,T]$, yields that

$$\Gamma^{1,n}_t = \Gamma^{1,n}_T + \int_t^T G^{1,n}_s ds + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T \Gamma^{1,n}_s e^{A^n_s} (dK^n_s - \theta dK^0_s) - \zeta_\theta \int_t^T \Gamma^{1,n}_s e^{A^n_s} V^n_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where $G^{1,n}_t = \zeta_\theta \, \Gamma^{1,n}_t e^{A^n_t} \big(f_n(t, Y^n_t, Z^n_t) - \theta f_0(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t) - a^n_t U^n_t - \frac{1}{2} \zeta_\theta e^{A^n_t} |V^n_t|^2 \big)$. Similar to (5.4), (H1) and the convexity of f_n in z show that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$f_n(t, Y^0_t, Z^n_t) \le \theta f_n\big(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t\big) + (1-\theta)\left(\alpha + \beta |Y^0_t|\right) + \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)} |V^n_t|^2,$$

which together with (H2) implies that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\begin{aligned} G^{1,n}_t &= \zeta_\theta \Gamma^{1,n}_t e^{A^n_t} \Big(f_n(t, \theta Y^0_t, Z^n_t) - \theta f_0(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t) - \tfrac{1}{2} \zeta_\theta e^{A^n_t} |V^n_t|^2 \Big) \\ &\le \zeta_\theta \Gamma^{1,n}_t e^{A^n_t} \Big(\big| f_n(t, \theta Y^0_t, Z^n_t) - f_n(t, Y^0_t, Z^n_t) \big| + f_n(t, Y^0_t, Z^n_t) - \theta f_0\big(t, Y^0_t, Z^0_t\big) - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)} |V^n_t|^2 \Big) \\ &\le \gamma e^{2\kappa T} \Gamma^{1,n}_t \big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa) |Y^0_t| \big) + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} \Gamma^{1,n}_t \big| \Delta_n f(t) \big|. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{1,n}_t &\le D_t \Gamma^{1,n}_t \le D_T \Gamma^{1,n}_T + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} \int_t^T D_s \Gamma^{1,n}_s \big| \Delta_n f(s) \big| ds + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T D_s \Gamma^{1,n}_s e^{A^n_s} dK^n_s - \zeta_\theta \int_t^T D_s \Gamma^{1,n}_s e^{A^n_s} V^n_s dB_s \\ &\le I^{n,1}_T + I^{n,2}_T + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} D_T \int_0^T \Gamma^{1,n}_s dK^n_s - \zeta_\theta \int_t^T D_s \Gamma^{1,n}_s e^{A^n_s} V^n_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

The flat-off condition of (Y^n, Z^n, K^n) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \Gamma^{1,n}_s dK^n_s &= \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^n_s = L^n_s\}} \Gamma^{1,n}_s dK^n_s = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^n_s = L^n_s \le L^0_s + \varepsilon\}} \Gamma^{1,n}_s dK^n_s + \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^n_s = L^n_s > L^0_s + \varepsilon\}} \Gamma^{1,n}_s dK^n_s \\ &\le \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{Y^n_s \le Y^0_s + \varepsilon\}} \exp\left\{ \gamma e^{2\kappa T} |Y^0_s| + \varepsilon \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} \right\} dK^n_s + \Upsilon_n \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{|L^n_s - L^0_s| > \varepsilon\}} dK^n_s \\ &\le \exp\left\{ \gamma e^{2\kappa T} Y^0_* + \varepsilon \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} \right\} K^n_T + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Upsilon_n \Big(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |L^n_t - L^0_t| \Big) K^n_T, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

For each $p \in (1, \infty)$, Theorem 4.1 and (S3) imply that

$$\sup_{n' \in \mathbb{N}} E\bigg[e^{p\gamma Y^{n'}_*} + \bigg(\int_0^T |Z^{n'}_s|^2 ds \bigg)^p + \big(K^{n'}_T\big)^p \bigg] \le c_p \sup_{n' \in \mathbb{N}} E\Big[e^{3p\gamma e^{\beta T} \left(\xi^+_{n'} \vee L^{n'}_* \right)} \Big] \le c_p \, \Xi\Big(3p\gamma e^{\beta T}\Big).$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} E\bigg[e^{p\gamma Y^m_*} + \bigg(\int_0^T |Z^m_s|^2 ds \bigg)^p + \big(K^m_T\big)^p \bigg] \le c_p \, \Xi\Big(3p\gamma e^{\beta T}\Big) + E\bigg[e^{p\gamma Y^0_*} + \bigg(\int_0^T |Z^0_s|^2 ds \bigg)^p + \big(K^0_T\big)^p \bigg] \overset{\triangle}{=} \widetilde{\Xi}(p), \tag{8.5}$$

which together with (S1) implies that

$$E[\eta^p_n] \le E\Big[e^{p \, \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} (|\xi_n| + |\xi_0|)} \Big] \le \frac{1}{2} E\left[e^{2p \, \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} (\xi^+_n \vee L^n_*)} + e^{2p \, \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} (\xi^+_0 \vee L^0_*)} \right] \le \Xi\Big(2p \, \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\Big), \tag{8.6}$$

$$E[\Upsilon^p_n] \le \frac{1}{2} E\left[e^{2p \, \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} Y^n_*} + e^{2p \, \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} Y^0_*} \right] \le \widetilde{\Xi}\Big(\tfrac{2p}{1-\theta} e^{2\kappa T} \Big), \tag{8.7}$$

$$E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big| \Delta_n f(s) \big| ds \bigg)^p \bigg] \le E\bigg[\bigg(2T(\alpha + \beta Y^0_*) + \gamma \int_0^T |Z^0_s|^2 ds \bigg)^p \bigg] \le c_p E\bigg[e^{p\gamma Y^0_*} + \bigg(\int_0^T |Z^0_s|^2 ds \bigg)^p \bigg], \tag{8.8}$$

$$E\bigg[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |L^n_t - L^0_t|^p \bigg] \le c_p E\Big[\big(L^n_*\big)^p + \big(L^0_*\big)^p \Big] \le c_p E\Big[e^{pL^n_*} + e^{pL^0_*} \Big] \le c_p \, \Xi(p). \tag{8.9}$$

Since $D_T \le c_0 \exp\Big\{\gamma(\beta+\kappa)Te^{2\kappa T}Y_*^0\Big\}$, P-a.s., we also see that $D_T \in \mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Thus, one can deduce from Young's inequality and (8.5)-(8.9) that random variables $I_T^{n,i}$, $i=1,2,3,4$ are all integrable. Moreover, the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Hölder's inequality imply that

$$E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\bigg|\int_0^t D_s\Gamma_s^{1,n}e^{A_s^n}V_s^n dB_s\bigg|\bigg] \le c_0 E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big(D_s\Gamma_s^{1,n}\big)^2 e^{2A_s^n}|V_s^n|^2 ds\bigg)^{\frac12}\bigg] \le c_0 E\bigg[D_T\Upsilon_n\bigg(\int_0^T |V_s^n|^2 ds\bigg)^{\frac12}\bigg]$$
$$\le c_0\,\|D_T\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(\mathcal{F}_T)}\,\|\Upsilon_n\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(\mathcal{F}_T)}\,\|V^n\|_{\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty, \tag{8.10}$$

thus $\int_0^\cdot D_s\Gamma_s^{1,n}e^{A_s^n}V_s^n dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale.

For any $t\in[0,T]$, taking $E[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ in (8.4) and (8.3) yields that $\Gamma_t^{1,n} \le \sum\limits_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}$, P-a.s. It then follows that

$$Y_t^n - \theta Y_t^0 \le \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}e^{-\kappa T - A_t^n}\ln\bigg(\sum_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}\bigg) \le \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\bigg(\sum_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}\bigg), \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

which implies that

$$Y_t^n - Y_t^0 \le (1-\theta)|Y_t^0| + \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\bigg(\sum_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}\bigg), \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{8.11}$$

To show the other half of (8.2), we set $\widetilde{U}^n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Y^0 - \theta Y^n$, $\widetilde{V}^n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Z^0 - \theta Z^n$ and define two processes

$$\tilde{a}_t^n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t^0 \ne Y_t^n\}}\frac{f_n(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^n) - f_n(t,Y_t^n,Z_t^n)}{Y_t^0 - Y_t^n} - \kappa\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_t^0 = Y_t^n\}}, \quad \widetilde{A}_t^n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \int_0^t \tilde{a}_s^n ds, \quad t\in[0,T].$$

Applying Itô's formula to the process $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \exp\big\{\zeta_\theta e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n}\widetilde{U}_t^n\big\}$, $t\in[0,T]$, yields that

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n} = \widetilde{\Gamma}_T^{1,n} + \int_t^T \widetilde{G}_s^{1,n}ds + \zeta_\theta\int_t^T \widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_s^n}(dK_s^0 - \theta dK_s^n) - \zeta_\theta\int_t^T \widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_s^n}\widetilde{V}_s^n dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T],$$

where $\widetilde{G}_t^{1,n} = \zeta_\theta\,\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n}\Big(f_0(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^0) - \theta f_n(t,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) - \tilde{a}_t^n\widetilde{U}_t^n - \tfrac12\zeta_\theta e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n}|\widetilde{V}_t^n|^2\Big)$. Similar to (5.4), (H1) and the convexity of f_n in z show that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.

$$f_n(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^0) \le \theta f_n\big(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^n\big) + (1-\theta)\left(\alpha+\beta|Y_t^0|\right) + \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}\big|\widetilde{V}_t^n\big|^2,$$

which together with (H2) implies that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{G}_t^{1,n} &\le \zeta_\theta\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n}\Big(-\Delta_n f(t) + f_n(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^0) - \theta f_n\big(t,Y_t^n,Z_t^n\big) - \tilde{a}_t^n\widetilde{U}_t^n - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|\widetilde{V}_t^n|^2\Big)\\
&\le \zeta_\theta\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n}\Big(\big|\Delta_n f(t)\big| + \theta f_n\big(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^n\big) - \theta f_n\big(t,Y_t^n,Z_t^n\big) - \tilde{a}_t^n\widetilde{U}_t^n + (1-\theta)\left(\alpha+\beta|Y_t^0|\right)\Big)\\
&= \zeta_\theta\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n}\big(\big|\Delta_n f(t)\big| + (\theta-1)\tilde{a}_t^n Y_t^0 + (1-\theta)\big(\alpha+\beta|Y_t^0|\big)\big) \le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}\big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)|Y_t^0|\big) + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}\big|\Delta_n f(t)\big|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (8.3), integration by parts gives that

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n} \le I_T^{n,1} + I_T^{n,2} + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}D_T\int_0^T \widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{1,n}dK_s^0 - \zeta_\theta\int_t^T D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_s^n}\widetilde{V}_s^n dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T], \tag{8.12}$$

where $\int_0^\cdot D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{1,n}e^{\widetilde{A}_s^n}\widetilde{V}_s^n dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, which can be shown by using similar arguments to those that lead to (8.10). And similar to (8.4), the flat-off condition of (Y^0,Z^0,K^0) implies that

$$\int_0^T \widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{1,n}dK_s^0 \le \exp\left\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y_*^n + \varepsilon\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\right\}K_T^0 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Upsilon_n\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|L_t^n - L_t^0|\Big)K_T^0, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{8.13}$$

For any $t \in [0,T]$, taking $E[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ in (8.13) and (8.12) yields that

$$Y_t^0 - Y_t^n \le (1-\theta)|Y_t^n| + \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma} \ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}\right), \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

which together with (8.11) as well as the continuity of processes Y^n, Y^0 and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^4 I^{n,i}$ implies (8.2).

Case 2: f_n is concave in z. Applying Itô's formula to the process $\Gamma_t^{2,n} \triangleq \big(\Gamma_t^{1,n}\big)^{-1} = \exp\big\{-\zeta_\theta e^{A_t^n} U_t^n\big\}$, $t \in [0,T]$ yields that

$$\Gamma_t^{2,n} = \Gamma_T^{2,n} + \int_t^T G_s^{2,n} ds + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T \Gamma_s^{2,n} e^{A_s^n} (\theta dK_s^0 - dK_s^n) + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T \Gamma_s^{2,n} e^{A_s^n} V_s^n dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where $G_t^{2,n} = \zeta_\theta \Gamma_t^{2,n} e^{A_t^n} \big(\theta f_0(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^0) - f_n(t, Y_t^n, Z_t^n) + a_t^n U_t^n - \frac{1}{2}\zeta_\theta e^{A_t^n} |V_t^n|^2\big)$. Similar to (5.15), (H1) and the concavity of f_n in z show that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$f_n(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^n) \ge \theta f_n\big(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^0\big) - (1-\theta)\big(\alpha + \beta|Y_t^0|\big) - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)} |V_t^n|^2, \tag{8.14}$$

which together with (H2) implies that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\begin{aligned} G_t^{2,n} &= \zeta_\theta \Gamma_t^{2,n} e^{A_t^n} \Big(-\theta \Delta_n f(t) + \theta f_n(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^0) - f_n(t, \theta Y_t^0, Z_t^n) - \tfrac{1}{2}\zeta_\theta e^{A_t^n} |V_t^n|^2\Big) \\ &\le \zeta_\theta \Gamma_t^{2,n} e^{A_t^n} \Big(|\Delta_n f(t)| + \theta f_n(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^0) - f_n(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^n) + |f_n(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^n) - f_n(t, \theta Y_t^0, Z_t^n)| - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)} |V_t^n|^2\Big) \\ &\le \gamma e^{2\kappa T} \Gamma_t^{2,n} \big(\alpha + (\beta+\kappa)|Y_t^0|\big) + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} \Gamma_t^{2,n} \big|\Delta_n f(t)\big|. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (8.3), integration by parts gives that

$$\Gamma_t^{2,n} \le I_T^{n,1} + I_T^{n,2} + \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T} D_T \int_0^T \Gamma_s^{2,n} dK_s^0 + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T D_s \Gamma_s^{2,n} e^{A_s^n} V_s^n dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{8.15}$$

where $\int_0^\cdot D_s \Gamma_s^{2,n} e^{A_s^n} V_s^n dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, which can be shown by using similar arguments to those lead to (8.10). And similar to (8.4), the flat-off condition of (Y^0, Z^0, K^0) implies that

$$\int_0^T \Gamma_s^{2,n} dK_s^0 \le \exp\big\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T} Y_*^n + \varepsilon \zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\big\} K_T^0 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Upsilon_n\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |L_t^n - L_t^0|\Big) K_T^0, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{8.16}$$

For any $t \in [0,T]$, taking $E[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ in (8.16) and (8.15) yields that $\Gamma_t^{2,n} \le \sum\limits_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}$, P-a.s. It then follows that

$$Y_t^0 - Y_t^n \le (1-\theta)|Y_t^0| + \theta Y_t^0 - Y_t^n \le (1-\theta)|Y_t^0| + \tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma} \ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^4 I_t^{n,i}\right), \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{8.17}$$

It remains to show the other half of (8.2) for Case 2. Applying Itô's formula to the process $\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{2,n} \triangleq \big(\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{1,n}\big)^{-1} = \exp\big\{-\zeta_\theta e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n} \widetilde{U}_t^n\big\}$, $t \in [0,T]$, yields that

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{2,n} = \widetilde{\Gamma}_T^{2,n} + \int_t^T \widetilde{G}_s^{2,n} ds + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T \widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{2,n} e^{\widetilde{A}_s^n} (\theta dK_s^n - dK_s^0) + \zeta_\theta \int_t^T \widetilde{\Gamma}_s^{2,n} e^{\widetilde{A}_s^n} \widetilde{V}_s^n dB_s, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where $\widetilde{G}_t^{2,n} = \zeta_\theta \widetilde{\Gamma}_t^{2,n} e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n} \Big(\theta f_n(t, Y_t^n, Z_t^n) - f_0(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^0) + \tilde{a}_t^n \widetilde{U}_t^n - \frac{1}{2}\zeta_\theta e^{\widetilde{A}_t^n} \big|\widetilde{V}_t^n\big|^2\Big)$. Similar to (8.14), (H1) and the concavity of f_n in z show that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$f_n(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^0) \ge \theta f_n\big(t, Y_t^0, Z_t^n\big) - (1-\theta)\big(\alpha + \beta|Y_t^0|\big) - \tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)} \big|\widetilde{V}_t^n\big|^2,$$

which together with (H2) implies that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{G}^{2,n}_t &\le \zeta_\theta \widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t e^{\widetilde{A}^n_t}\Big(\theta f_n\big(t,Y^n_t,Z^n_t\big)-f_n(t,Y^0_t,Z^0_t)+\Delta_n f(t)+\tilde{a}^n_t\widetilde{U}^n_t-\tfrac{\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}|\widetilde{V}^n_t|^2\Big)\\ &\le \zeta_\theta \widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t e^{\widetilde{A}^n_t}\Big(\theta f_n\big(t,Y^n_t,Z^n_t\big)-\theta f_n\big(t,Y^0_t,Z^n_t\big)+\big|\Delta_n f(t)\big|+\tilde{a}^n_t\widetilde{U}^n_t+(1-\theta)\left(\alpha+\beta|Y^0_t|\right)\Big)\\ &= \zeta_\theta \widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t e^{\widetilde{A}^n_t}\big((1-\theta)\tilde{a}^n_t Y^0_t+\big|\Delta_n f(t)\big|+(1-\theta)\big(\alpha+\beta|Y^0_t|\big)\big)\le \gamma e^{2\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t\big(\alpha+(\beta+\kappa)|Y^0_t|\big)+\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t\big|\Delta_n f(t)\big|.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (8.15), integration by parts gives that

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t \le I^{n,1}_T+I^{n,2}_T+\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}D_T\int_0^T\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_s dK^n_s+\zeta_\theta\int_t^T D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_s e^{\widetilde{A}^n_s}\widetilde{V}^n_s dB_s, \quad t\in[0,T], \tag{8.18}$$

where $\int_0^\cdot D_s\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_s e^{\widetilde{A}^n_s}\widetilde{V}^n_s dB_s$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, which can be shown by using similar arguments to those lead to (8.10). And similar to (8.4), the flat-off condition of (Y^n,Z^n,K^n) implies that

$$\int_0^T\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_s dK^n_s \le \exp\left\{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}Y^0_*+\varepsilon\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}\right\}K^n_T+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Upsilon_n\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|L^n_t-L^0_t|\Big)K^n_T, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{8.19}$$

For any $t\in[0,T]$, taking $E[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ in (8.19) and (8.18) yields that $\widetilde{\Gamma}^{2,n}_t\le\sum\limits_{i=1}^4 I^{n,i}_t$, P-a.s. It then follows that

$$Y^n_t-Y^0_t\le(1-\theta)|Y^n_t|+\theta Y^n_t-Y^0_t\le(1-\theta)|Y^0_t|+\tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^4 I^{n,i}_t\right), \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

which together with (8.17) as well as the continuity of processes Y^n, Y^0 and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^4 I^{n,i}$ implies (8.2).

2) For any $\delta>0$, (8.2), (8.5), (8.7), Doob's martingale inequality and Hölder's inequality imply that

$$\begin{aligned}P\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y^n_t-Y^0_t|\ge\delta\Big)&\le P\Big((1-\theta)\big(Y^0_*+Y^n_*\big)\ge\delta/2\Big)+P\left(\tfrac{1-\theta}{\gamma}\ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^4 I^{n,i}_*\right)\ge\delta/2\right)\\ &\le 2\tfrac{1-\theta}{\delta}E\big[Y^0_*+Y^n_*\big]+\sum_{i=1}^4 P\Big(I^{n,i}_*\ge\tfrac{1}{4}e^{\frac{\delta\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}}\Big)\le\tfrac{1-\theta}{\delta\gamma}E\Big[e^{2\gamma Y^0_*}+e^{2\gamma Y^n_*}\Big]+4e^{\frac{-\delta\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}}\sum_{i=1}^4 E\Big[I^{n,i}_T\Big]\\ &\le 2\tfrac{1-\theta}{\delta\gamma}\widetilde{\Xi}(2)+4e^{\kappa T}e^{\frac{-\delta\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}}C\bigg(\big\|\eta_n\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{F}_T)}+\zeta_\theta\left\{\widetilde{\Xi}\Big(\tfrac{8}{1-\theta}e^{2\kappa T}\Big)\right\}^{\frac14}\big\|\textstyle\int_0^T|\Delta_n f(s)|ds\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(\mathcal{F}_T)}+1+\zeta_\theta e^{\varepsilon\zeta_\theta e^{\kappa T}}\\ &\quad+\frac{\zeta_\theta}{\varepsilon}\left\{\widetilde{\Xi}\Big(\tfrac{8}{1-\theta}e^{2\kappa T}\Big)\right\}^{\frac14}\big\|L^n-L^0\big\|_{\mathbb{C}^4_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\bigg),\end{aligned} \tag{8.20}$$

with $C=1+\big\|D_T\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{F}_T)}+\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\Big(E\Big[D_T e^{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}(Y^0_*+Y^n_*)}\big(K^0_T+K^n_T\big)\Big]+\big\|D_T\big(K^0_T+K^n_T\big)\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{F}_T)}\Big)$. Hölder's inequality and (8.5) show that C is a finite constant.

The convergence of $\Delta_n f$ to 0 and (S1) imply that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\Delta_n f(t,\omega)=0 \quad\text{and}\quad |\Delta_n f(t,\omega)|\le 2\alpha+2\beta Y^0_*(\omega)+\gamma\big|Z^0_t(\omega)\big|^2, \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{8.21}$$

Hence, for P-a.s. $\omega\in\Omega$ we may assume that (8.21) holds for a.e. $t\in[0,T]$, and that $Y^0_*(\omega)+\int_0^T\big|Z^0_s(\omega)\big|^2 ds<\infty$. The Dominated convergence theorem then yields that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\int_0^T\big|\Delta_n f(s,\omega)\big|ds=0$. By (S2), it also holds P-a.s. that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\eta_n=e^{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}|\xi_0|} \quad\text{and}\quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|L^n_t-L^0_t|\Big)=0.$$

Using (8.6), (8.8) and (8.9) with any $p>4$ shows that $\big\{\eta_n^2\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\Big\{\Big(\int_0^T\big|\Delta_n f(s)\big|ds\Big)^4\Big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\Big\{\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}|L_t^n-L_t^0|^4\Big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are all uniformly integrable sequences in $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, which leads to that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}E\big[\eta_n^2\big]=E\Big[e^{2\gamma e^{2\kappa T}|\xi_0|}\Big]\quad\text{and}\quad\lim_{n\to\infty}E\left[\bigg(\int_0^T\big|\Delta_n f(s)\big|ds\bigg)^4+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|L_t^n-L_t^0|^4\right]=0.$$

Hence, letting $n\to\infty$ in (8.20) and then letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ yield that

$$\varlimsup_{n\to\infty}P\bigg(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|\ge\delta\bigg)\le 2\tfrac{1-\theta}{\delta\gamma}\widetilde{\Xi}(2)+4e^{\kappa T}e^{\frac{-\delta\gamma}{2(1-\theta)}}C\left(1+\big\|e^{\gamma e^{2\kappa T}|\xi_0|}\big\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{F}_T)}+\tfrac{\gamma e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}\right).$$

As $\theta\to 1$, we obtain $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}P\bigg(\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|\ge\delta\bigg)=0$, which implies that for any $p\in[1,\infty)$, $\exp\Big\{p\gamma\cdot\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|\Big\}$ converges to 1 in probability.

3) Fix $p\in[1,\infty)$. Since $E\bigg[\exp\Big\{2p\gamma\cdot\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|\Big\}\bigg]\le\frac{1}{2}E\Big[e^{4p\gamma Y_*^n}+e^{4p\gamma Y_*^0}\Big]\le\widetilde{\Xi}(4p)$ holds for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$ thanks to (8.5), we see that $\bigg\{\exp\Big\{p\gamma\cdot\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|\Big\}\bigg\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a uniformly integrable sequence in $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then it follows that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}E\bigg[\exp\Big\{p\gamma\cdot\sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]}\big|Y_t^n-Y_t^0\big|\Big\}\bigg]=1$, which in particular implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^q\bigg]=0,\qquad\forall\,q\in[1,\infty).\tag{8.22}$$

For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, applying Itô's formula to the process $|Y^n-Y^0|^2$, we can deduce from (S1) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T|Z_s^n-Z_s^0|^2ds\;&=\;|\xi_n-\xi_0|^2-|Y_0^n-Y_0^0|^2+2\int_0^T(Y_s^n-Y_s^0)\big(f_n(s,Y_s^n,Z_s^n)-f_0(s,Y_s^0,Z_s^0)\big)\,ds\\&\quad+2\int_0^T(Y_s^n-Y_s^0)(dK_s^n-dK_s^0)-2\int_0^T(Y_s^n-Y_s^0)(Z_s^n-Z_s^0)\,dB_s\\&\le\;2\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|\bigg(2\alpha T+\beta T\big(Y_*^n+Y_*^0\big)+\frac{\gamma}{2}\int_0^T\big(|Z_s^n|^2+|Z_s^0|^2\big)ds+K_T^n+K_T^0\bigg)\\&\quad+\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^2+2\left|\int_0^T(Y_s^n-Y_s^0)(Z_s^n-Z_s^0)\,dB_s\right|,\quad P\text{-a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

Then the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, Hölder's inequality, and (8.5) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T|Z_s^n-Z_s^0|^2ds\bigg)^p\bigg]&\le c_pE\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^{2p}\bigg]+c_pE\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^p\cdot\bigg(\int_0^T|Z_s^n-Z_s^0|^2\,ds\bigg)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right]\\&\quad+c_p\left\{E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^{2p}\bigg]\right\}^{\frac12}\left\{\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}E\left[e^{2p\gamma Y_*^m}+\bigg(\int_0^T|Z_s^m|^2ds\bigg)^{2p}+\big(K_T^m\big)^{2p}\right]\right\}^{\frac12}\\&\le c_pE\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^{2p}\bigg]+\frac12E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T|Z_s^n-Z_s^0|^2ds\bigg)^p\bigg]+c_p\sqrt{\widetilde{\Xi}(2p)}\left\{E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^{2p}\bigg]\right\}^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $E\Big[\Big(\int_0^T|Z_s^n-Z_s^0|^2ds\Big)^p\Big]<\infty$ as $Z^n,Z^0\in\mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,2p}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence, it follows that

$$E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T|Z_s^n-Z_s^0|^2ds\bigg)^p\bigg]\le c_pE\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^{2p}\bigg]+c_p\sqrt{\widetilde{\Xi}(2p)}\left\{E\bigg[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n-Y_t^0|^{2p}\bigg]\right\}^{\frac12}.$$

As $n \to \infty$, (8.22) implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s^n - Z_s^0|^2 ds\right)^p\right] = 0. \tag{8.23}$$

In particular, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T |Z_s^n - Z_s^0|^2 ds = 0. \tag{8.24}$$

4) Let us further assume that $dt \otimes dP$-a.e., $f_n(t,\omega,y,z)$ converges to $f_0(t,\omega,y,z)$ locally uniformly in (y,z). By (8.22) and (8.24), $\big\{(Y^n,Z^n)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence (we still denote it by $\big\{(Y^n,Z^n)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^n - Y_t^0| = 0, \quad P\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} Z_t^n = Z_t^0, \quad dt\otimes dP\text{-a.e.} \tag{8.25}$$

In fact, we can choose this subsequence so that $Z^* \overset{\triangle}{=} \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}}|Z^n| \in \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$; see [15] or [13, Lemma 2.5]. Hence, except on a $dt\otimes dP$-null set of $[0,T]\times\Omega$, one may suppose the following statements hold:
(i) $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} Y_t^n(\omega) = Y_t^0(\omega)$ and $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} Z_t^n(\omega) = Z_t^0(\omega)$,
(ii) The mapping $f_0(t,\omega,\cdot,\cdot)$ is continuous,
(iii) For any compact subset $\mathscr{K}$ of $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\Big(\sup\limits_{(y,z)\in\mathscr{K}}\big|f_n\big(t,\omega,y,z\big) - f_0\big(t,\omega,y,z\big)\big|\Big) = 0$.

Let $\mathscr{K}(t,\omega) \overset{\triangle}{=} \Big\{(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d : |y| \le \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}}|Y_t^n(\omega)| < \infty \text{ and } |z| \le Z_t^*(\omega) < \infty\Big\}$, which is clearly a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\big|f_n(t,\omega,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) - f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^0,Z_t^0)\big| &\le \big|f_n(t,\omega,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) - f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^n,Z_t^n)\big| + \big|f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) - f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^0,Z_t^0)\big| \\ &\le \sup_{(y,z)\in\mathscr{K}(t,\omega)}\big|f_n(t,\omega,y,z) - f_0(t,\omega,y,z)\big| + \big|f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) - f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^0,Z_t^0)\big|, \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N},\end{aligned}$$

letting $n\to\infty$ yields that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(t,\omega,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) = f_0(t,\omega,Y_t^0,Z_t^0). \tag{8.26}$$

By (S1), it also holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$\big|f_n(t,Y_t^n,Z_t^n) - f_0(t,Y_t^0,Z_t^0)\big| \le 2\alpha + 2\beta\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} Y_*^m + \frac{\gamma}{2}\Big(\big|Z_t^*\big|^2 + \big|Z_t^0\big|^2\Big), \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N}, \tag{8.27}$$

where $\sup\limits_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} Y_*^m < \infty$, P-a.s. thanks to (8.25). Thus, for P-a.s. $\omega\in\Omega$ we may assume that (8.26) and (8.27) hold for a.e. $t\in[0,T]$, as well as that $\sup\limits_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} Y_*^m(\omega) + \int_0^T\Big(\big|Z_s^*(\omega)\big|^2 + \big|Z_s^0(\omega)\big|^2\Big)ds < \infty$. The Dominated convergence theorem then yields that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\int_0^T\big|f_n(s,\omega,Y_s^n,Z_s^n) - f_0(s,\omega,Y_s^0,Z_s^0)\big|ds = 0$.

Fix $p\in[1,\infty)$. For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, (S1) and (8.5) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}E\left[\left(\int_0^T\big|f_n(s,Y_s^n,Z_s^n) - f_0(s,Y_s^0,Z_s^0)\big|ds\right)^{2p}\right] &\le c_p E\left[\left(2\alpha T + \beta T\big(Y_*^n + Y_*^0\big) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\int_0^T\big(|Z_s^n|^2 + |Z_s^0|^2\big)ds\right)^{2p}\right] \\ &\le c_p\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} E\left[e^{2p\gamma Y_*^m} + \left(\int_0^T |Z_s^m|^2 ds\right)^{2p}\right] \le c_p\,\widetilde{\Xi}(2p),\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\Big\{\Big(\int_0^T\big|f_n(s,Y_s^n,Z_s^n) - f_0(s,Y_s^0,Z_s^0)\big|ds\Big)^p\Big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a uniformly integrable sequence in $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Hence, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\left(\int_0^T\big|f_n(s,Y_s^n,Z_s^n) - f_0(s,Y_s^0,Z_s^0)\big|ds\right)^p\right] = 0. \tag{8.28}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds P-a.s. that

$$K_T^n - K_T^0 = Y_0^n - Y_0^0 - (\xi_n - \xi_0) - \int_0^T \big(f_n(s, Y_s^n, Z_s^n) - f_0(s, Y_s^0, Z_s^0)\big)\, ds + \int_0^T (Z_s^n - Z_s^0)\, dB_s.$$

The Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality then implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\big|K_T^n - K_T^0\big|^p\Big] \ \le \ & c_p E\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |Y_t^n - Y_t^0|^p\Big] + c_p E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big|f_n(s, Y_s^n, Z_s^n) - f_0(s, Y_s^0, Z_s^0)\big| ds\bigg)^p\bigg] \\ & + c_p E\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T |Z_s^n - Z_s^0|^2 ds\bigg)^{\frac{p}{2}}\bigg], \end{aligned}$$

where $E\bigg[\Big(\int_0^T |Z_s^n - Z_s^0|^2 ds\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\bigg] \le \Big\{E\Big[\Big(\int_0^T |Z_s^n - Z_s^0|^2 ds\Big)^p\Big]\Big\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ due to Hölder's inequality. As $n \to \infty$, (8.22), (8.28) and (8.23) lead to (8.1). $\square$

9 An Obstacle Problem for PDEs.

In this section, we show that in the Markovian case, quadratic RBSDEs with unbounded obstacles provide a probabilistic interpretation of solutions of some obstacle problem for semi-linear parabolic PDEs, in which the non-linearity appears as the square of the gradient.

For any $t \in [0, \infty)$, $B^t = \{B_s^t \overset{\triangle}{=} B_{t+s} - B_t\}_{s\in[0,\infty)}$ is also a d-dimensional standard Brownian Motion on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Let $\mathbf{F}^t$ be the augmented filtration generated by B^t, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{F}^t = \Big\{\mathcal{F}_s^t \overset{\triangle}{=} \sigma\Big(\sigma\big(B_r^t; r \in [0, s]\big) \cup \mathcal{N}\Big)\Big\}_{s\in[0,\infty)}.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\kappa \ge 0$ and $\varpi \in [1, 2)$. We consider the following functions:

1) $b : [0, T]\times\mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\sigma : [0, T]\times\mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{k\times d}$ are two continuous functions such that $\sigma_* \overset{\triangle}{=} \sup\limits_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k} |\sigma(t, x)| < \infty$, and that

$$|b(t, x) - b(t, x')| + |\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, x')| \le \kappa|x - x'|, \quad \forall\, t \in [0, T],\ \forall\, x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^k. \tag{9.1}$$

2) $h : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ and $l : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ are two continuous functions such that

$$l(T, x) \le h(x), \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k \quad \text{and} \quad |h(x)| \vee |l(t, x)| \le \kappa\big(1 + |x|^{\varpi}\big), \quad \forall\, (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k. \tag{9.2}$$

3) $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a jointly continuous function that satisfies

i) There exist $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that for any $(t, x, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}$

$$|f(t, x, y, z)| \le \alpha + \beta|y| + \frac{\gamma}{2}|z|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |f(t, x, y, z) - f(t, x, y', z)| \le \kappa|y - y'|\,; \tag{9.3}$$

ii) The mapping $z \to f(t, x, y, z)$ is

- either *convex* for all $(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$, (9.4)
- or *concave* for all $(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$. (9.5)

For any $\lambda \ge 0$, we let $\widetilde{c}_\lambda$ denote a generic constant, depending on $\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa, \varpi, T, \sigma_*$ and on $b_0 \overset{\triangle}{=} \sup\limits_{t\in[0,T]} |b(t, 0)| < \infty$, whose form may vary from line to line.

Given $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$, it is well-known that the SDE

$$X_s = x + \int_t^s b(r, X_r)dr + \int_t^s \sigma(r, X_r)dB_r, \quad s \in [t,T] \tag{9.6}$$

admits a unique solution $\{X_s^{t,x}\}_{s\in[t,T]}$, an $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued continuous process, such that $X_s^{t,x} \in \mathcal{F}_{s-t}^t \subset \mathcal{F}_s$ for any $s \in [t,T]$. In addition, we set $X_s^{t,x} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} x,\ \forall\, s \in [0,t]$.

The following lemma gives an estimate for the exponential moments of process $\big\{|X_s^{t,x}|^{\varpi}\big\}_{s\in[t,T]}$.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $p \in [1,\infty)$. For any $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$, we have*

$$E\left[\exp\left\{p \sup_{s\in[t,T]} \big|X_s^{t,x}\big|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \le \widetilde{c}_p \exp\left\{p\, 3^{\varpi-1} e^{\kappa\varpi T}|x|^{\varpi}\right\}.$$

Proof: One can deduce from (9.6) and (9.1) that P-a.s.

$$\sup_{s\in[t,t']} \big|X_s^{t,x}\big| \le |x| + b_0T + \kappa \int_t^{t'} \sup_{s\in[t,r]} \big|X_s^{t,x}\big|\,dr + \sup_{s\in[t,T]} \left|\int_t^s \sigma\left(r, X_r^{t,x}\right) dB_r\right|, \quad t' \in [t,T].$$

Then Gronwall's inequality implies that P-a.s.

$$\sup_{s\in[t,t']} \big|X_s^{t,x}\big| \le e^{\kappa T}\left(|x| + b_0T + \sup_{s\in[t,T]} \left|\int_t^s \sigma\left(r, X_r^{t,x}\right) dB_r\right|\right), \quad t' \in [t,T].$$

Letting $t' = T$ and taking power of ϖ yield that

$$\sup_{s\in[t,T]} \big|X_s^{t,x}\big|^{\varpi} \le 3^{\varpi-1}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\left(|x|^{\varpi} + (b_0T)^{\varpi} + \sup_{s\in[t,T]} \left|\int_t^s \sigma\left(r, X_r^{t,x}\right) dB_r\right|^{\varpi}\right), \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{9.7}$$

Let $\mathbf{1}_{k\times d}$ denote the $k \times d$ matrix whose entries are all 1's. We define an $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued process

$$M_s \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \int_0^s \Big(\mathbf{1}_{\{t\le r\le T\}}\sigma\left(r, X_r^{t,x}\right) + \mathbf{1}_{\{r>T\}}\mathbf{1}_{k\times d}\Big)\, dB_r, \quad \forall\, s \in [0,\infty).$$

Given $i \in \{1,\cdots,k\}$, it is clear that M^i is an $\mathbb{R}$-valued continuous martingale such that $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty} \langle M^i\rangle_s = \infty$. For any $s \in [0,\infty)$, we define an $\mathbf{F}$-stopping time $\tau_s^i \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \inf\big\{r \in [0,\infty) : \langle M^i\rangle_r > s\big\}$. In light of the Dambis-Dubins-Schwarz Theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 3.4.6 of [12]), $W_s^i \stackrel{\triangle}{=} M_{\tau_s^i}^i$, $s \in [0,\infty)$ defines an 1-dimensional standard Brownian Motion on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ with respect to the filtration $\big\{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_s^i}\big\}_{s\in[0,\infty)}$, and it holds P-a.s. that $M_s^i = W_{\langle M^i\rangle_s}^i$ for any $s \in [0,\infty)$.

The convexity of function $y \to e^{|y|^{\varpi}}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and Jensen's inequality imply that $\Big\{\exp\big\{\big|W_s^i\big|^{\varpi}\big\}\Big\}_{s\in[0,\infty)}$ is a continuous positive submartingale with respect to the filtration $\big\{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_s^i}\big\}_{s\in[0,\infty)}$. Applying Doob's Martingale Inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sup_{s\in[0,\sigma_*^2 T]}\Big(\exp\big\{\big|W_s^i\big|^{\varpi}\big\}\Big)^{pk}\right] &\le \left(\tfrac{pk}{pk-1}\right)^{pk} E\left[\Big(\exp\Big\{\Big|W_{\sigma_*^2 T}^i\Big|^{\varpi}\Big\}\Big)^{pk}\right] \\ &= \left(\tfrac{pk}{pk-1}\right)^{pk} E\left[\exp\Big\{pk\big(\sigma_*\sqrt{T}\big)^{\varpi}\,\big|W_1^i\big|^{\varpi}\Big\}\right] \le \widetilde{c}_p\, E\left[\exp\left\{\frac{1}{4}\big|W_1^i\big|^2\right\}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.8}$$

As W_1^i is a standard normal random variable under P, we have

$$E\left[\exp\left\{\frac{1}{4}\big|W_1^i\big|^2\right\}\right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{4}y^2}dy = \sqrt{2}. \tag{9.9}$$

For any $p \in (1,\infty)$, since $\langle M^i \rangle_s = \int_t^s \sum_{j=1}^d \big(\sigma_{ij}\big(r, X_r^{t,x}\big)\big)^2 dr \le \sigma_*^2 T$ for any $s \in [t,T]$, one can deduce from (9.8), (9.9) and Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\exp\left\{p \sup_{s\in[t,T]} \left|\int_t^s \sigma\left(r, X_r^{t,x}\right) dB_r\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] &= E\left[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} \exp\left\{p\left|M_s\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \le E\left[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} \exp\left\{p \sum_{i=1}^k \left|M_s^i\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \\ &= E\left[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} \prod_{i=1}^k \exp\left\{p\left|W^i_{\langle M^i\rangle_s}\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \le E\left[\prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sup_{s\in[t,T]} \exp\left\{p\left|W^i_{\langle M^i\rangle_s}\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right)\right] \\ &\le E\left[\prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sup_{s\in[0,\sigma_*^2T]} \exp\left\{p\left|W_s^i\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right)\right] \le \left\{\prod_{i=1}^k E\left[\sup_{s\in[0,\sigma_*^2T]} \exp\left\{pk\left|W_s^i\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right]\right\}^{\frac{1}{k}} \le \widetilde{c}_p, \end{aligned} \tag{9.10}$$

where we used in the first inequality the fact that $|x|^{\varpi} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |x^i|^2\right)^{\frac{\varpi}{2}} \le \sum_{i=1}^k \left(|x^i|^2\right)^{\frac{\varpi}{2}} = \sum_{i=1}^k |x^i|^{\varpi}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Plugging it back into (9.7) proves the lemma. □

Our objective in this section is to find a unique viscosity solution of the following obstacle problem for semi-linear parabolic PDEs:

$$\begin{cases} \min\left\{(u-l)(t,x), -\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x) - \mathcal{L}u(t,x) - f\big(t,x,u(t,x),(\sigma^T\cdot\nabla_x u)(t,x)\big)\right\} = 0, \ \ \forall\,(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k, \\ u(T,x) = h(x), \ \ \forall\, x\in\mathbb{R}^k, \end{cases} \tag{9.11}$$

where σ^T denotes the transpose of σ and $\mathcal{L}u(t,x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}\big((\sigma\sigma^T D_x^2 u)(t,x)\big) + \langle b(t,x), \nabla_x u(t,x)\rangle$.

Now let us consider the obstacle problem for PDEs in a more general form:

$$\begin{cases} \min\left\{(u-\mathfrak{l})(t,x), -\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x) - F\left(t,x,u(t,x),\nabla_x u(t,x), D_x^2 u(t,x)\right)\right\} = 0, \ \ \forall\,(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k, \\ u(T,x) = \mathfrak{h}(x), \ \ \forall\, x\in\mathbb{R}^k, \end{cases} \tag{9.12}$$

where $\mathfrak{h} : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{l} : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, and $F : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{S}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ are all (jointly) continuous functions with $\mathbb{S}^k$ denoting the set of all real symmetric $k\times k$ matrices.

Definition 9.1. *A function $u \in C([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k)$ is called a viscosity subsolution (resp. viscosity supersolution) of (9.12) if $u(T,x) \le$ (resp. $\ge$) $\mathfrak{h}(x)$, $\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and if for any $(t_0,x_0,\varphi) \in (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k\times C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$ such that $u(t_0,x_0) = \varphi(t_0,x_0)$ and that $u-\varphi$ attains a local maximum (resp. local minimum) at (t_0,x_0), we have*

$$\min\left\{(u-\mathfrak{l})(t_0,x_0), -\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) - F\Big(t_0,x_0,u(t_0,x_0),\nabla_x\varphi(t_0,x_0), D_x^2\varphi(t_0,x_0)\Big)\right\} \le (\textit{resp. } \ge)\ 0.$$

A function $u \in C([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k)$ is called a viscosity solution of (9.12) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution of (9.12).

One can alternatively define viscosity subsolutions/supersolutions of (9.12) in term of second-order superjets/subjets (see [6]).

Definition 9.2. *1) For a function $u : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, its second-order superjet (resp. subjet) at some $(t_0,x_0) \in (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(t_0,x_0)$ $\big($resp. $\mathcal{P}^{2,-}u(t_0,x_0)\big)$, is a collection of all triplets $(p,q,W) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{S}^k$ such that as $(t,x)\to(t_0,x_0)$ in $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k$,*

$$u(t,x) \le (\textit{resp. } \ge)\ u(t_0,x_0) + p(t-t_0) + \langle q, x-x_0\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\big\langle W(x-x_0), x-x_0\big\rangle + o\big(|t-t_0| + |x-x_0|^2\big).$$

2) For a function $u : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ *and some* $(t_0,x_0) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^k$, *we define* $\overline{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(t_0,x_0)$ *(resp.* $\overline{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(t_0,x_0)$*) as the collection of all triplets* $(p,q,W) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{S}^k$ *such that for some sequence* $\big\{(t_n,x_n,p_n,q_n,W_n)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{S}^k$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (p_n,q_n,W_n) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(t_n,x_n)\ \big(\textit{resp.}\ \mathcal{P}^{2,-}u(t_n,x_n)\big), \quad \forall\, n\in\mathbb{N} \\
\textit{and} \qquad & \big(t_0,x_0,u(t_0,x_0),p,q,W\big) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\big(t_n,x_n,u(t_n,x_n),p_n,q_n,W_n\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 9.3. *A function* $u \in C([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k)$ *is called a viscosity subsolution (resp. viscosity supersolution) of* (9.12) *if* $u(T,x) \le$ *(resp.* $\ge$*)* $\mathfrak{h}(x)$, $\forall\, x\in\mathbb{R}^k$, *and if for any* $(t_0,x_0) \in (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k$ *and* $(p,q,W) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(t_0,x_0)$ $\big($*resp.* $\overline{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(t_0,x_0)\big)$, *we have*

$$
\min\Big\{(u-\mathfrak{l})(t_0,x_0), -p - F\big(t_0,x_0,u(t_0,x_0),q,W\big)\Big\} \le (\textit{resp.}\ \ge)\ 0.
$$

A function $u\in C([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k)$ *is called a viscosity solution of* (9.12) *if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution of* (9.12).

For any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k$, let $\mathscr{P}^{\,t}$ denote the $\mathbf{F}^t$-progressively measurable σ-field on $[0,T-t]\times\Omega$. Since $\widetilde{X}^{t,x}_s \stackrel{\triangle}{=} X^{t,x}_{t+s}$, $s\in[0,T-t]$ is an $\mathbf{F}^t$-adapted continuous process, the joint continuity of f implies that

$$
\tilde{f}^{t,x}(s,\omega,y,z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} f\Big(t+s, \widetilde{X}^{t,x}_s(\omega), y, z\Big), \quad \forall\,(s,\omega,y,z)\in[0,T-t]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d
$$

is a $\mathscr{P}^{\,t}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable function, namely, it is a generator with respect to $\mathbf{F}^t$ over the period $[0,T-t]$. By (9.3)-(9.5), $\tilde{f}^{t,x}$ also satisfies (H1)-(H3). On the other hand, (9.2) shows that $\big\{\widetilde{L}^{t,x}_s \stackrel{\triangle}{=} l\big(t+s,\widetilde{X}^{t,x}_s\big)\big\}_{s\in[0,T-t]}$ is also an $\mathbf{F}^t$-adapted continuous process such that $\widetilde{L}^{t,x}_{T-t} = l\big(T,X^{t,x}_T\big) \le h\big(X^{t,x}_T\big) \in \mathcal{F}^t_{T-t}$. For any $p\in[1,\infty)$, (9.2) and Lemma 9.1 imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\Big(\big|h\big(X^{t,x}_T\big)\big| \vee \widetilde{L}^{t,x}_*\Big)\Big\}\Big] &\le E\bigg[\exp\bigg\{p\kappa\bigg(1+\sup_{s\in[t,T]}\big|X^{t,x}_s\big|^{\varpi}\bigg)\bigg\}\bigg] \\
&\le e^{p\kappa}E\bigg[\exp\bigg\{(1\vee p\kappa)\sup_{s\in[t,T]}\big|X^{t,x}_s\big|^{\varpi}\bigg\}\bigg] \le \widetilde{c}_p \exp\big\{(1\vee p\kappa)\,3^{\varpi-1}e^{\kappa\varpi T}|x|^{\varpi}\big\}. \qquad (9.13)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, Corollary 5.1 shows that the quadratic $\mathrm{RBSDE}\Big(h(X^{t,x}_T), \tilde{f}^{t,x}, \widetilde{L}^{t,x}\Big)$ with respect to B^t over the period $[0,T-t]$ admits a unique solution $\Big(\widetilde{Y}^{t,x},\widetilde{Z}^{t,x},\widetilde{K}^{t,x}\Big)$ in $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}^t}[0,T-t]$.

The continuity of process $\big\{X^{t,x}_s\big\}_{s\in[0,T]}$ and (9.3)-(9.5) imply that

$$
f^{t,x}(s,\omega,y,z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t\}}\tilde{f}^{t,x}(s-t,\omega,y,z) = \mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t\}}f\big(s,X^{t,x}_s(\omega),y,z\big), \ \ \forall\,(s,\omega,y,z)\in[0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d
$$

is a $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable function that satisfies (H1)-(H3) with the same constants $\alpha,\beta,\kappa\ge0$ and $\gamma>0$ as f. Let $L^{t,x}_s \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \widetilde{L}^{t,x}_{(s-t)^+} = l\big(s\vee t, X^{t,x}_{s\vee t}\big)$, $s\in[0,T]$, which is clearly an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted continuous process with $L^{t,x}_T = \widetilde{L}^{t,x}_{T-t} \le h\big(X^{t,x}_T\big)$. Then one can show that

$$
\big(Y^{t,x}_s, Z^{t,x}_s, K^{t,x}_s\big) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big(\widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_{(s-t)^+}\,,\mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t\}}\widetilde{Z}^{t,x}_{s-t}\,,\mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t\}}\widetilde{K}^{t,x}_{s-t}\Big)\,, \quad s\in[0,T]
$$

satisfies the quadratic $\mathrm{RBSDE}\Big(h(X^{t,x}_T), f^{t,x}, L^{t,x}\Big)$ over the period $[0,T]$, and that $\big(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x},K^{t,x}\big) \in \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. Since $E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\Big(\big|h\big(X^{t,x}_T\big)\big|\vee L^{t,x}_*\Big)\Big\}\Big] < \infty$ by (9.13), Corollary 5.1 again shows that $\big(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x},K^{t,x}\big)$ is the unique solution of the quadratic $\mathrm{RBSDE}\Big(h(X^{t,x}_T), f^{t,x}, L^{t,x}\Big)$ in $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$.

The main objective of this section is to demonstrate that

$$u(t,x) \overset{\triangle}{=} \widetilde{Y}_0^{t,x} = Y_t^{t,x}, \quad \forall\, (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \tag{9.14}$$

is a viscosity solution of (9.11). First, we recall a well-known moment estimate of diffusion process $X^{t,x}$, without proof, in order to show that u is a continuous function.

Lemma 9.2. *For any $(t,x),(t',x') \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$, we have*

$$E\bigg[\sup_{r\in[t,s]}\big|X_r^{t,x}-x\big|^2\bigg] \;\le\; \widetilde{c}_0\big(1+|x|^2\big)(s-t), \quad \forall\, s \in [t,T], \tag{9.15}$$

$$E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[\tilde{t}\vee t,T]}\big|X_s^{\tilde{t},\tilde{x}}-X_s^{t,x}\big|^2\bigg] \;\le\; \widetilde{c}_0 E\Big[\big|X_{\tilde{t}\vee t}^{\tilde{t},\tilde{x}}-X_{\tilde{t}\vee t}^{t,x}\big|^2\Big]. \tag{9.16}$$

Proposition 9.1. *The function u defined in (9.14) is a continuous one such that $|u(t,x)| \le \widetilde{c}_0\big(1+|x|^{\varpi}\big)$ for any $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$.*

Proof: Given $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$, we let $\big\{(t_n^0,x_n^0)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$ be an arbitrary sequence that converges to (t,x). Without loss of generality, we assume that $\{x_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \overline{B}_1(x) \overset{\triangle}{=} \{\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k : |\tilde{x}-x| \le 1\}$. To see $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} u\big(t_n^0,x_n^0\big) = u(t,x)$, we only need to show that any subsequence $\{u(t_n,x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\big\{u(t_n^0,x_n^0)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has in turn a subsequence that converges to $u(t,x)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (9.16) shows that

$$E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t_n\vee t,T]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x}\big|^2\bigg] \le \widetilde{c}_0 E\Big[\big|X_{t_n\vee t}^{t_n,x_n}-X_{t_n\vee t}^{t,x}\big|^2\Big] \le \widetilde{c}_0 E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t_n\wedge t,t_n\vee t]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x}\big|^2\bigg]. \tag{9.17}$$

When $t_n \le t$, (9.15) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t_n\wedge t,t_n\vee t]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x}\big|^2\bigg] &= E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t_n,t]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-x\big|^2\bigg] \le 2|x_n-x|^2 + 2E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t_n,t]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-x_n\big|^2\bigg] \\ &\le 2|x_n-x|^2 + \widetilde{c}_0\big(1+|x_n|^2\big)(t-t_n). \end{aligned} \tag{9.18}$$

Similarly, when $t_n > t$,

$$E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t_n\wedge t,t_n\vee t]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x}\big|^2\bigg] \le 2|x_n-x|^2 + \widetilde{c}_0\big(1+|x_n|^2\big)(t_n-t). \tag{9.19}$$

Since $X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x} = x_n - x$ for any $s \in [0,\ t_n \wedge t]$, (9.17) and (9.18) (or (9.19)) imply that

$$E\bigg[\sup_{s\in[0,T]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x}\big|^2\bigg] \le \widetilde{c}_0|x_n-x|^2 + \widetilde{c}_0\big(1+|x_n|^2\big)|t_n-t| \to 0, \ \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Hence, we can extract a subsequence of $\{(t_n,x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ $\big($we still denote it by $\{(t_n,x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\big)$ such that except on a P-null set $\mathscr{N}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\sup_{s\in[0,T]}\big|X_s^{t_n,x_n}-X_s^{t,x}\big|\Big) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{the path } s \to X_s^{t,x} \text{ is continuous.} \tag{9.20}$$

To apply Theorem 8.1 to the sequence $\big\{\big(Y^{t_n,x_n}, Z^{t_n,x_n}, K^{t_n,x_n}\big)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, let us check the assumptions of this theorem first. We have seen that $f^{t,x}$ together with $\big\{f^{t_n,x_n}\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfy (S1).

Fix $\omega \in \mathscr{N}^c$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the continuity of functions h and l assures that there exists a $\delta(\omega) \in (0,1)$ such that

$$|h(\tilde{x})-h(x')| \vee |l(\tilde{s},\tilde{x})-l(s',x')| < \varepsilon, \ \ \forall\, (\tilde{s},\tilde{x}),(s',x') \in [0,T] \times \mathscr{D}(\omega) \text{ with } |\tilde{s}-s'|^2 + |\tilde{x}-x'|^2 < \delta^2(\omega),$$

where $\mathscr{D}(\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k : |\tilde{x}| \le 1 + \sup\limits_{s\in[0,T]} \big|X^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big| < \infty\Big\}$. Moreover, in light of (9.20), there exists an $N(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \ge N(\omega)$,

$$|t_n - t| \vee \sup_{s\in[0,T]} \big|X^{t_n,x_n}_s(\omega) - X^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big| < \frac{\delta(\omega)}{2}.$$

Then for any $n \ge N(\omega)$, one can deduce the following statements:

- $\big|h\big(X^{t_n,x_n}_T(\omega)\big) - h\big(X^{t,x}_T(\omega)\big)\big| < \varepsilon$,
- for any $s \in [t_n \vee t, T]$, $\big|L^{t_n,x_n}_s(\omega) - L^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big| = \big|l\big(s, X^{t_n,x_n}_s(\omega)\big) - l\big(s, X^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big)\big| < \varepsilon$;
- for any $s \in [0, t_n \vee t]$, if $t_n \le t$, $\big|L^{t_n,x_n}_s(\omega) - L^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big| = \big|l\big(s \vee t_n, X^{t_n,x_n}_{s\vee t_n}(\omega)\big) - l\big(t, X^{t,x}_t(\omega)\big)\big| = \big|l\big(s \vee t_n, X^{t_n,x_n}_{s\vee t_n}(\omega)\big) - l\big(t, X^{t,x}_{s\vee t_n}(\omega)\big)\big| < \varepsilon$ since $s \vee t_n \in [t_n, t]$; on the other hand, if $t_n > t$, one can similarly deduce that $\big|L^{t_n,x_n}_s(\omega) - L^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big| < \varepsilon$.

Thus (S2) is satisfied.

For any $p \in [1,\infty)$, we have seen from (9.13) that

$$E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\Big(\big|h\big(X^{t,x}_T\big)\big| \vee L^{t,x}_*\Big)\Big\}\Big] = E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\Big(\big|h\big(X^{t,x}_T\big)\big| \vee \widetilde{L}^{t,x}_*\Big)\Big\}\Big] \le \widetilde{c}_p \exp\big\{(1 \vee p\kappa)\, 3^{\varpi-1} e^{\kappa\varpi T} |x|^{\varpi}\big\}.$$

Similarly, it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\Big(\big|h\big(X^{t_n,x_n}_T\big)\big| \vee L^{t_n,x_n}_*\Big)\Big\}\Big] &\le \widetilde{c}_p \exp\big\{(1 \vee p\kappa)\, 3^{\varpi-1} e^{\kappa\varpi T} |x_n|^{\varpi}\big\} \\ &\le \widetilde{c}_p \exp\big\{(1 \vee p\kappa)\, 3^{\varpi-1} e^{\kappa\varpi T} \big(1+|x|\big)^{\varpi}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (S3) also holds.

Given $(s,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathscr{N}^c \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \big|f^{t_n,x_n}(s,\omega,y,z) - f^{t,x}(s,\omega,y,z)\big| &\le \big|f\big(s, X^{t_n,x_n}_s(\omega), y, z\big) - f\big(s, X^{t,x}_s(\omega), y, z\big)\big| \\ &\quad + \big|\mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t_n\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{s\ge t\}}\big| \cdot \big|f\big(s, X^{t,x}_s(\omega), y, z\big)\big|. \end{aligned}$$

As $n \to \infty$, the continuity of f and (9.20) imply that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} f^{t_n,x_n}(s,\omega,y,z) = f^{t,x}(s,\omega,y,z)$, which in particular shows that for $dt \otimes dP$-a.e. $(s,\omega) \in [0,T]\times\Omega$, $f^{t_n,x_n}\big(s,\omega,Y^{t,x}_s(\omega), Z^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big)$ converges to $f^{t,x}\big(s,\omega,Y^{t,x}_s(\omega), Z^{t,x}_s(\omega)\big)$.

Now, applying Theorem 8.1 yields that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} E\Big[\exp\Big\{\sup\limits_{s\in[0,T]} \big|Y^{t_n,x_n}_s - Y^{t,x}_s\big|\Big\}\Big] = 1$, which allows us to extract a subsequence $\{(t_{n_i}, x_{n_i})\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ from $\{(t_n,x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \sup\limits_{s\in[0,T]} \big|Y^{t_{n_i},x_{n_i}}_s - Y^{t,x}_s\big| = 0$, P-a.s. In particular, one has

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} u\big(t_{n_i}, x_{n_i}\big) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \widetilde{Y}^{t_{n_i},x_{n_i}}_0 = \lim_{i\to\infty} Y^{t_{n_i},x_{n_i}}_0 = Y^{t,x}_0 = \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_0 = u(t,x),$$

which shows that u is a continuous function. Moreover, Corollary 5.1, (9.2) and Lemma 9.1 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} -\kappa\big(1+|x|^{\varpi}\big) &\le l(t,x) = \widetilde{L}^{t,x}_0 \le u(t,x) = \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_0 \le \widetilde{c}_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln E\Big[\exp\Big\{\gamma e^{\beta T}\big(\big|h(X^{t,x}_T)\big| \vee \widetilde{L}^{t,x}_*\big)\Big\}\Big] \\ &\le \widetilde{c}_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln E\Big[\exp\Big\{\gamma\kappa e^{\beta T} \sup_{s\in[t,T]} |X^{t,x}_s|^{\varpi}\Big\}\Big] \le \widetilde{c}_0\big(1+|x|^{\varpi}\big). \end{aligned}$$

□

For any $\xi \in \mathcal{O}^{t,x} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \big\{\xi \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathcal{F}_T) : \xi \ge L^{t,x}_T, P\text{-a.s. and } E\big[e^{p\,\xi^+}\big] < \infty,\ \forall\, p \in (1,\infty)\big\}$, Corollary 5.1 guarantees a unique solution $\big(Y^{t,x,\xi}, Z^{t,x,\xi}, K^{t,x,\xi}\big)$ of the quadratic RBSDE$\Big(\xi, f^{t,x}, L^{t,x}\Big)$ in $\bigcap\limits_{p\in[1,\infty)} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. For each $s \in [0,T]$, we can regard $\mathcal{E}^{t,x}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_s] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Y^{t,x,\xi}_s$, $\xi \in \mathcal{O}^{t,x}$ as a nonlinear conditional expectation on $\mathcal{O}^{t,x}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}_s$ (cf. g-expectations in the case of BSDEs, see e.g. [22], [18], Subsection 5.4 of [2] and Section 7 of the current paper). Then the diffusion $X^{t,x}$ has the following Markov property under $\mathcal{E}^{t,x}$:

Proposition 9.2. *Let u be the function defined in* (9.14)*. For any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k$ it holds P-a.s. that*

$$u\big(s,X_s^{t,x}\big)=Y_s^{t,x}=\widetilde{Y}_{s-t}^{t,x},\quad s\in[t,T]. \tag{9.21}$$

Proof: 1) We fix $s\in[t,T]$ and denote $\Theta_{t'}^0\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\Theta_{t'}^{t,x}$, $t'\in[s,T]$ for $\Theta=X,Y,Z,K$. Given $n\in\mathbb{N}$, there exist a finite subset $\{x_i^n\}_{i=1}^{j_n}$ of $B_{2^n}(0)\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\{x\in\mathbb{R}^k:|x|<2^n\}$ and a disjoint partition $\{\mathcal{I}_i^n\}_{i=1}^{j_n}$ of $B_{2^n}(0)$ such that $x_i^n\in\mathcal{I}_i^n\in\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ and $\mathcal{I}_i^n\subset\overline{B}_{2^{-n}}(x_i^n)$ for $i=1,\cdots,j_n$. Let

$$\mathcal{A}_i^n\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\big\{X_s^0\in\mathcal{I}_i^n\big\}\in\mathcal{F}_s,\quad\forall\, i=1,\cdots,j_n\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{A}_0^n\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\big\{X_s^0\in B_{2^n}^c(0)\big\}\in\mathcal{F}_s.$$

For any $t'\in[s,T]$ and $\Theta=X,Y,Z,K$, we define $\Theta_{t'}^n\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\sum\limits_{i=0}^{j_n}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}\Theta_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}\in\mathcal{F}_{t'}$ with $x_0^n\stackrel{\triangle}{=}0$. Then for any $i=0,\cdots,j_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}X_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}&=x_i^n\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}+\int_s^{t'}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}b\Big(r,X_r^{s,x_i^n}\Big)dr+\int_s^{t'}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}\sigma\Big(r,X_r^{s,x_i^n}\Big)dB_r\\&=x_i^n\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}+\int_s^{t'}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}b\big(r,X_r^n\big)dr+\int_s^{t'}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}\sigma\big(r,X_r^n\big)\,dB_r,\quad P\text{-a.s.};\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}l\big(t',X_{t'}^n\big)=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}l\big(t',X_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}\big)=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}L_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}\le\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}Y_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}\\&=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}h\big(X_T^{s,x_i^n}\big)+\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}f\big(r,X_r^{s,x_i^n},Y_r^{s,x_i^n},Z_r^{s,x_i^n}\big)dr+\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}K_T^{s,x_i^n}-\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}K_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}-\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}Z_r^{s,x_i^n}dB_r\\&=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}h\big(X_T^n\big)+\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}f\big(r,X_r^n,Y_r^n,Z_r^n\big)dr+\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}K_T^n-\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}K_{t'}^n-\int_{t'}^T\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}Z_r^ndB_r,\quad P\text{-a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

Summing up both expressions over $i=0,\cdots,j_n$, one can deduce from the continuity of function l as well as the continuity of processes $\{X_{t'}^n\}_{t'\in[s,T]}$, $\{Y_{t'}^n\}_{t'\in[s,T]}$ and $\{K_{t'}^n\}_{t'\in[s,T]}$ that P-a.s.

$$X_{t'}^n=X_s^n+\int_s^{t'}b(r,X_r^n)dr+\int_s^{t'}\sigma(r,X_r^n)dB_r,\quad t'\in[s,T]; \tag{9.22}$$

$$l\big(t',X_{t'}^n\big)\le Y_{t'}^n=h(X_T^n)+\int_{t'}^T f(r,X_r^n,Y_r^n,Z_r^n)dr+K_T^n-K_{t'}^n-\int_{t'}^T Z_r^ndB_r,\quad t'\in[s,T]. \tag{9.23}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\int_s^T\big(Y_r^n-l(r,X_r^n)\big)dK_r^n=\sum_{i=0}^{j_n}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}\int_s^T\Big(Y_r^{s,x_i^n}-L_r^{s,x_i^n}\Big)dK_r^{s,x_i^n}=0,\quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{9.24}$$

By (9.6), it holds P-a.s. that

$$X_{t'}^0=X_s^0+\int_s^{t'}b(r,X_r^0)dr+\int_s^{t'}\sigma(r,X_r^0)dB_r,\quad t'\in[s,T].$$

Subtracting it from (9.22), we can deduce from (9.1) that P-a.s.

$$\sup_{s'\in[s,t']}\big|X_{s'}^n-X_{s'}^0\big|\le\big|X_s^n-X_s^0\big|+\kappa\int_s^{t'}\big|X_r^n-X_r^0\big|dr+\sup_{s'\in[s,t']}\left|\int_s^{s'}\big(\sigma(r,X_r^n)-\sigma(r,X_r^0)\big)dB_r\right|,\ t'\in[s,T]. \tag{9.25}$$

By similar arguments to those that lead to (9.7), we can deduce from (9.25) that P-a.s.

$$\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X_{t'}^n-X_{t'}^0\big|^\varpi\le2^{\varpi-1}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\left(\big|X_s^n-X_s^0\big|^\varpi+\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\left|\int_s^{t'}\big(\sigma(r,X_r^n)-\sigma(r,X_r^0)\big)dB_r\right|^\varpi\right).$$

And using similar arguments to those that lead to (9.10), we can deduce that for any $p \in (1,\infty)$

$$E\left[\exp\left\{p \sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\left|\int_s^{t'} \big(\sigma(r,X_r^n)-\sigma(r,X_r^0)\big)dB_r\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \le \widetilde{c}_p.$$

Then Hölder's inequality implies that

$$E\left[\exp\left\{p \sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X_{t'}^n - X_{t'}^0\big|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \le \left\{E\left[\exp\left\{p\,2^{\varpi}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\left|\int_s^{t'} \big(\sigma(r,X_r^n)-\sigma(r,X_r^n)\big)dB_r\right|^{\varpi}\right\}\right]\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\times\Big\{E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\,2^{\varpi}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\big|X_s^n - X_s^0\big|^{\varpi}\Big\}\Big]\Big\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \widetilde{c}_p\Big\{E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\,2^{2\varpi-1}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\big|X_s^0\big|^{\varpi}\Big\}\Big]\Big\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we used the fact that

$$\big|X_s^n - X_s^0\big| = \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s^0|<2^n\}}\big|X_s^n - X_s^0\big| + \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s^0|\ge 2^n\}}\big|X_s^0\big| \le 2^{-n} + \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s^0|\ge 2^n\}}\big|X_s^0\big|. \tag{9.26}$$

Thus it follows that for any $p \in [1,\infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\exp\left\{p \sup_{t'\in[s,T]}|X_{t'}^n|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] &\le \frac{1}{2}E\left[\exp\left\{p2^{\varpi}\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X_{t'}^n - X_{t'}^0\big|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] + \frac{1}{2}E\left[\exp\left\{p2^{\varpi}\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X_{t'}^0\big|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \\ &\le \widetilde{c}_p + E\left[\exp\left\{p\,2^{3\varpi-1}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X_{t'}^0\big|^{\varpi}\right\}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.27}$$

As $\Big\{\big(Y^{s,x_i^n}, Z^{s,x_i^n}, K^{s,x_i^n}\big)\Big\}_{i=0,\cdots,j_n} \subset \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{F}}^p[0,T]$, one can deduce that for any $p \in [1,\infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[\exp\Big\{p\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}|Y_{t'}^n|\Big\} + \left(\int_s^T |Z_r^n|^2 dr\right)^p + \big(K_T^n\big)^p\right] \\ &\quad = E\left[\sum_{i=0}^{j_n}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_i^n}\left(\exp\Big\{p\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|Y_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}\big|\Big\} + \left(\int_s^T \big|Z_r^{s,x_i^n}\big|^2 dr\right)^p + \Big(K_T^{s,x_i^n}\Big)^p\right)\right] \\ &\quad \le \sum_{i=0}^{j_n}E\left[\exp\Big\{p\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|Y_{t'}^{s,x_i^n}\big|\Big\} + \left(\int_s^T \big|Z_r^{s,x_i^n}\big|^2 dr\right)^p + \Big(K_T^{s,x_i^n}\Big)^p\right] < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{9.28}$$

2) Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\mathcal{X}_{t'}^m \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{t'<s\}}E[X_s^m|\mathcal{F}_{t'}] + \mathbf{1}_{\{t'\ge s\}}X_{t'}^m$, $t' \in [0,T]$ is an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted continuous process, the continuity of function l and f shows that $\mathcal{L}_{t'}^m \stackrel{\triangle}{=} l\big(t',\mathcal{X}_{t'}^m\big)$, $t' \in [0,T]$ is also an $\mathbf{F}$-adapted continuous process, and that

$$f_m(t',\omega,y,z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} f\big(t',\mathcal{X}_{t'}^m(\omega),y,z\big), \quad \forall\,(t',\omega,y,z) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{R}^d$$

is a $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable function. Moreover, (9.3)-(9.5) show that f_m satisfies (H1)-(H3) with the same constants $\alpha,\beta,\kappa \ge 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ as f. For any $p \in (1,\infty)$, the convexity of function $y \to e^{|y|^{\varpi}}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and Jensen's inequality imply that $\left\{\exp\left\{\Big(E\big[|X_s^n|\big|\mathcal{F}_{t'}\big]\Big)^{\varpi}\right\}\right\}_{t'\in[0,\infty)}$ is a continuous positive submartingale. Doob's Martingale Inequality then shows that

$$E\left[\sup_{t'\in[0,s]}\left(\exp\left\{\Big(E\big[|X_s^m|\big|\mathcal{F}_{t'}\big]\Big)^{\varpi}\right\}\right)^p\right] \le \big(\tfrac{p}{p-1}\big)^p E\Big[\Big(\exp\big\{|X_s^m|^{\varpi}\big\}\Big)^p\Big],$$

which together with (9.27) and Lemma 9.1 leads to that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\big(\mathcal{X}_*^m\big)^{\varpi}\Big\}\Big] &\le E\left[\sup_{t'\in[0,s]}\exp\left\{p\Big(E\big[|X_s^m|\big|\mathcal{F}_{t'}\big]\Big)^{\varpi}\right\}\right] + E\left[\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\exp\Big\{p\,\big|X_{t'}^m\big|^{\varpi}\Big\}\right] \\ &\le \widetilde{c}_p E\left[\exp\left\{p\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}|X_{t'}^m|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \le \widetilde{c}_p + \widetilde{c}_p E\left[\exp\left\{p\,2^{3\varpi-1}e^{\kappa\varpi T}\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X_{t'}^0\big|^{\varpi}\right\}\right] \\ &\le \widetilde{c}_p + \widetilde{c}_p\exp\big\{p\,2^{3\varpi-1}3^{\varpi-1}e^{2\kappa\varpi T}|x|^{\varpi}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows from (9.2) that

$$E\Big[\exp\Big\{p\Big(\big|h\big(\mathcal{X}^m_T\big)\big|\vee\mathcal{L}^m_*\Big)\Big\}\Big]\le e^{p\kappa}E\big[\exp\big\{(1\vee p\kappa)\big(\mathcal{X}^m_*\big)^{\varpi}\big\}\big]\le\widetilde{c}_p+\widetilde{c}_p\exp\big\{(1\vee p\kappa)\,2^{3\varpi-1}3^{\varpi-1}e^{2\kappa\varpi T}|x|^{\varpi}\big\}\,. \tag{9.29}$$

As $Y^{t,x}\in\mathbb{E}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$, we also see from (9.28) that $E\Big[e^{p\,|Y^m_s|}\Big]<\infty$. Since $Y^m_s\ge l\big(s,X^m_s\big)=l\big(s,\mathcal{X}^m_s\big)=\mathcal{L}^m_s$, P-a.s., Corollary 5.1 implies that the quadratic RBSDE$(Y^m_s,f_m,\mathcal{L}^m)$ over time interval $[0,s]$ admits a unique solution $\big\{(\mathcal{Y}^m_r,\mathcal{Z}^m_r,\mathcal{K}^m_r)\big\}_{r\in[0,s]}$ in $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,s]$.

We extend the processes $(\mathcal{Y}^m,\mathcal{Z}^m,\mathcal{K}^m)$ to the period $(s,T]$ by setting: $\forall\,t'\in(s,T]$,

$$(\mathcal{Y}^m_{t'},\mathcal{Z}^m_{t'})\stackrel{\triangle}{=}(Y^m_{t'},Z^m_{t'})\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{K}^m_{t'}\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\begin{cases}\mathcal{K}^0_s+K^0_{t'}-K^0_s, & \text{if } m=0;\\ \mathcal{K}^m_s+K^m_{t'}, & \text{if } m\in\mathbb{N}.\end{cases}$$

Then (9.23) and (9.24) imply that $\{(\mathcal{Y}^m_{t'},\mathcal{Z}^m_{t'},\mathcal{K}^m_{t'})\}_{t'\in[0,T]}$ is a solution of the quadratic RBSDE$\big(h(\mathcal{X}^m_T),f_m,\mathcal{L}^m\big)$. As $(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x},K^{t,x})\in\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$, we see from (9.28) that $(\mathcal{Y}^m,\mathcal{Z}^m,\mathcal{K}^m)\in\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$. Moreover, Corollary 5.1 and (9.29) show that $(\mathcal{Y}^m,\mathcal{Z}^m,\mathcal{K}^m)$ is the unique solution of the quadratic RBSDE$\big(h(\mathcal{X}^m_T),f_m,\mathcal{L}^m\big)$ in $\underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap}\mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$.

3) Squaring both sides of (9.25), one can deduce from Hölder's inequality, Doob's martingale inequality, Fubini's Theorem and (9.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}E\bigg[\sup_{s'\in[s,t']}\big|X^n_{s'}-X^0_{s'}\big|^2\bigg]\;&\le\;3E\Big[\big|X^n_s-X^0_s\big|^2\Big]+3\kappa^2TE\int_s^{t'}\big|X^n_r-X^0_r\big|^2dr+12\,E\int_s^{t'}\big|\sigma(r,X^n_r)-\sigma(r,X^0_r)\big|^2dr\\&\le\;3E\Big[\big|X^n_s-X^0_s\big|^2\Big]+3\kappa^2(T+4)\int_s^{t'}E\bigg[\sup_{s'\in[s,r]}\big|X^n_{s'}-X^0_{s'}\big|^2\bigg]\,dr,\quad t'\in[s,T].\end{aligned}$$

Then Gronwall's inequality and (9.26) imply that

$$E\bigg[\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X^n_{t'}-X^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg]\le3E\Big[\big|X^n_s-X^0_s\big|^2\Big]\;e^{3\kappa^2(T^2+4T)}\le\widetilde{c}_0\bigg(2^{-2n}+E\Big[\mathbf{1}_{\{|X^0_s|\ge2^n\}}\big|X^0_s\big|^2\Big]\bigg).$$

As $E\Big[\big|X^{t,x}_s\big|^2\Big]<\infty$ by (9.15), letting $n\to\infty$ yields that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}E\bigg[\sup\limits_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X^n_{t'}-X^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg]=0$. Since Doob's martingale inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}E\bigg[\sup_{t'\in[0,T]}\big|\mathcal{X}^n_{t'}-\mathcal{X}^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg]\;&\le\;E\bigg[\sup_{t'\in[0,s]}\Big|E[X^n_s-X^0_s|\mathcal{F}_{t'}]\Big|^2\bigg]+E\bigg[\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X^n_{t'}-X^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg]\\&\le\;4E\Big[\big|X^n_s-X^0_s\big|^2\Big]+E\bigg[\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X^n_{t'}-X^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg]\le5E\bigg[\sup_{t'\in[s,T]}\big|X^n_{t'}-X^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg],\end{aligned}$$

it follows that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}E\bigg[\sup\limits_{t'\in[0,T]}\big|\mathcal{X}^n_{t'}-\mathcal{X}^0_{t'}\big|^2\bigg]=0$. Hence, we can pick up a subsequence of $\{\mathcal{X}^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (we still denote it by $\{\mathcal{X}^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) such that except on a P-null set $\mathscr{N}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\sup_{t'\in[0,T]}\big|\mathcal{X}^n_{t'}-\mathcal{X}^0_{t'}\big|\Big)=0\quad\text{and}\quad\text{the path } t'\to\mathcal{X}^0_{t'}\text{ is continuous.} \tag{9.30}$$

To apply Theorem 8.1 to the sequence $\big\{\big(\mathcal{Y}^n,\mathcal{Z}^n,\mathcal{K}^n\big)\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, let us check the assumptions of this theorem first. We have seen that the sequence $\{f_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfies (S1), and that (9.29) justifies (S3).

Fix $\omega\in\mathscr{N}^c$. For any $\varepsilon>0$, the continuity of h assures that there exists a $\delta(\omega)\in(0,1)$ such that

$$|h(\tilde{x})-h(x')|\vee|l(\tilde{s},\tilde{x})-l(s',x')|<\varepsilon,\;\;\forall\,(\tilde{s},\tilde{x}),(s',x')\in[0,T]\times\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}(\omega)\text{ with }|\tilde{s}-s'|^2+|\tilde{x}-x'|^2<\delta^2(\omega),$$

where $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}(\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k : |\tilde{x}| \le 1 + \sup\limits_{t' \in [0,T]} \big|\mathcal{X}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big| < \infty\Big\}$. Moreover, in light of (9.30), there exists an $N(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \ge N(\omega)$, $\sup\limits_{t' \in [0,T]} \big|\mathcal{X}^n_{t'}(\omega) - \mathcal{X}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big| < \delta(\omega)$. Then it holds for any $n \ge N(\omega)$ that

$$\big|h\big(\mathcal{X}^n_T(\omega)\big) - h\big(\mathcal{X}^0_T(\omega)\big)\big| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \big|\mathcal{L}^n_{t'}(\omega) - \mathcal{L}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big| = \big|\, l\big(t'\mathcal{X}^n_{t'}(\omega)\big) - l\big(t'\mathcal{X}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big)\big| < \varepsilon, \quad t' \in [0,T].$$

Thus (S2) is satisfied.

Given $(t', \omega) \in [0,T] \times \mathscr{N}^c$, the continuity of f and (9.30) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n\big(t', \omega, \mathcal{Y}^0_{t'}(\omega), \mathcal{Z}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} f\big(t', \mathcal{X}^n_{t'}(\omega), \mathcal{Y}^0_{t'}(\omega), \mathcal{Z}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big) = f\big(t', \mathcal{X}^0_{t'}(\omega), \mathcal{Y}^0_{t'}(\omega), \mathcal{Z}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big) \\ &= f_0\big(t', \omega, \mathcal{Y}^0_{t'}(\omega), \mathcal{Z}^0_{t'}(\omega)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Now, applying Theorem 8.1 yields that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} E\left[\exp\left\{\sup\limits_{t' \in [0,T]} \big|\mathcal{Y}^n_{t'} - \mathcal{Y}^0_{t'}\big|\right\}\right] = 1$, which allows us to extract a subsequence of $\{\mathcal{Y}^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (we still denote it by $\{\mathcal{Y}^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) such that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \sup\limits_{t' \in [0,T]} \big|\mathcal{Y}^n_{t'} - \mathcal{Y}^0_{t'}\big| = 0$, P-a.s. In particular, it holds P-a.s. that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Y^n_s = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{Y}^n_s = \mathcal{Y}^0_s = Y^0_s = Y^{t,x}_s, \tag{9.31}$$

where

$$Y^n_s = \sum_{i=0}^{j_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}^n_i} Y^{s,x^n_i}_s = \sum_{i=0}^{j_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}^n_i} u\big(s, x^n_i\big) = \sum_{i=0}^{j_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}^n_i} u\big(s, X^n_s\big) = u\big(s, X^n_s\big), \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} X^n_s = X^0_s = X^{t,x}_s$, P-a.s. by (9.26), Proposition 9.1 and (9.31) then imply that

$$Y^{t,x}_s = \lim_{n\to\infty} u\big(s, X^n_s\big) = u\big(s, X^{t,x}_s\big), \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Eventually, the continuity of processes $X^{t,x}$, $Y^{t,x}$ and Proposition 9.1 leads to (9.21). □

Theorem 9.1. *The function u defined in* (9.14) *is a viscosity solution of* (9.11).

Proof: 1) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, it is clear that $u(T,x) = \widetilde{Y}^{T,x}_0 = h\big(X^{T,x}_T\big) = h(x)$. We first show that u is a viscosity subsolution of (9.11). Let $(t_0, x_0, \varphi) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^k \times C^{1,2}\big([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k\big)$ be such that $u(t_0,x_0) = \varphi(t_0,x_0)$ and that $u - \varphi$ attains a local maximum at (t_0, x_0). We prove by contradiction. Suppose that

$$\varepsilon \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{(u-l)(t_0,x_0), -\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{L}\varphi(t_0,x_0) - f\big(t_0, x_0, \varphi(t_0,x_0), (\sigma^T \nabla_x \varphi)(t_0,x_0)\big)\right\} > 0.$$

Since $\varphi \in C^{1,2}\big([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k\big)$, the continuity of functions u, l, f and σ as well as the assumption on local maximum of $u - \varphi$ assure that there exists a $\delta \in \big(0, T - t_0\big]$ such that for any $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \delta]$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $|x - x_0| \le \delta$

$$|u(t,x) - u(t_0,x_0)| \le \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon, \quad (u-l)(t,x) \ge \varepsilon, \quad (u-\varphi)(t,x) \le 0, \tag{9.32}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad -\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t,x) - \mathcal{L}\varphi(t,x) - f\big(t, x, \varphi(t,x), (\sigma^T \nabla_x \varphi)(t,x)\big) \ge \varepsilon. \tag{9.33}$$

Since $\big\{\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big\}_{s\in[0,T-t_0]}$ and $\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}$ are both $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$-adapted continuous processes,

$$\nu \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \inf\Big\{s \in [0,\delta] : \big|\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s - x_0\big| > \delta\Big\} \wedge \inf\Big\{s \in [0,\delta] : \big|\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_s - \widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_0\big| > \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon\Big\} \wedge \delta \tag{9.34}$$

defines an $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$-stopping time such that $\nu > 0$, P-a.s. For any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in [0, \nu(\omega)]$, one can deduce from (9.32) that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_s(\omega) &\ge \widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_0 - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon = u(t_0,x_0) - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon \ge u\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s(\omega)\big) - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon \\ &\ge l\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s(\omega)\big) + \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon = \widetilde{L}^{t_0,x_0}_s(\omega) + \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Because $\big(\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}, \widetilde{Z}^{t_0,x_0}, \widetilde{K}^{t_0,x_0}\big) \in \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{S}^p_{\mathbf{F}^{t_0}}[0, T-t_0]$ solves the quadratic RBSDE$\Big(h\big(X^{t_0,x_0}_T\big), \tilde{f}^{t_0,x_0}, \widetilde{L}^{t_0,x_0}\Big)$ with respect to B^{t_0} over the period $[0, T-t_0]$, its flat-off condition implies that P-a.s., $\widetilde{K}^{t_0,x_0}_s = 0$ for any $s \in [0,\nu]$. Hence, it holds P-a.s. that

$$\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu\wedge s} = \widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu} + \int_{\nu\wedge s}^{\nu} \tilde{f}^{t_0,x_0}\Big(r, \widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_r, \widetilde{Z}^{t_0,x_0}_r\Big)dr - \int_{\nu\wedge s}^{\nu} \widetilde{Z}^{t_0,x_0}_r dB^{t_0}_r, \quad s \in [0,\delta].$$

In other words, the processes $\big(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}\big) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\Big(\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu\wedge s}, \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}\widetilde{Z}^{t_0,x_0}_s\Big)\Big\}_{s\in[0,\delta]} \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}^{t_0}}[0,\delta] \times \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}^{t_0}}([0,\delta];\mathbb{R}^d)$ solves the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Y}_s &= \widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu + \int_s^\delta \mathfrak{f}\,(r, \mathcal{Y}_r, \mathcal{Z}_r)\,dr - \int_s^\delta \mathcal{Z}_r dB^{t_0}_r, \quad s \in [0,\delta], \\ \text{with} \quad \mathfrak{f}(s,\omega,y,z) &\stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu(\omega)\}}\tilde{f}^{t_0,x_0}(s,\omega,y,z), \quad \forall\,(s,\omega,y,z) \in [0,\delta]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \tag{9.35}$$

Like $\tilde{f}^{t_0,x_0}$, $\mathfrak{f}$ is a generator with respect to $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$ over the period $[0,\delta]$ that satisfies (H1)-(H3).

On the other hand, since

$$\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s = x + \int_0^s b(r+t_0, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_r)dr + \int_0^s \sigma(r+t_0, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_r)dB^{t_0}_r, \quad s \in [0, T-t_0],$$

applying Itô's formula to the process $\varphi(t_0 + \cdot, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\cdot)$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi\big(t_0+\nu\wedge s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu\wedge s}\big) &= \varphi\big(t_0+\nu, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu\big) - \int_{\nu\wedge s}^{\nu} \big(\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}\varphi\big)\big(t_0+r, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_r\big)dr \\ &\quad - \int_{\nu\wedge s}^{\nu} (\sigma^T \nabla_x \varphi)\big(t_0+r, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_r\big)dB^{t_0}_r, \quad s \in [0,\delta].\end{aligned}$$

Namely, $\big(\mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{Z}'\big) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\Big(\varphi\big(t_0+\nu\wedge s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu\wedge s}\big), \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}(\sigma^T\nabla_x\varphi)\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big)\Big)\Big\}_{s\in[0,\delta]}$ solves the BSDE

$$\mathcal{Y}'_s = \varphi\big(t_0+\nu, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu\big) + \int_s^\delta \mathfrak{f}'_r dr - \int_s^\delta \mathcal{Z}'_r dB^{t_0}_r, \quad s \in [0,\delta],$$

where $\mathfrak{f}'_s \stackrel{\triangle}{=} -\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}\big(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}\varphi\big)\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big)$, $\forall\, s \in [0,\delta]$. Since $\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}$ is an $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$-adapted continuous process, and since $\varphi \in C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$, the continuity of function σ implies that $\mathcal{Y}'$ is an $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$-adapted continuous process as well as that $\mathcal{Z}'$ and $\mathfrak{f}'$ are both $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$-progressively measurable processes. Moreover, since $\big|\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s - x_0\big| \le \delta$ holds for P-a.s. $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in \big[0, \nu(\omega)\big]$, and since $\varphi \in C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$, we further see from the continuity of function b and the boundedness of function σ that $\mathcal{Y}'$, $\mathcal{Z}'$ and $\mathfrak{f}'$ are all bounded processes.

One can deduce from Proposition 9.2 and (9.32) -(9.34) that

$$\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu = u\big(t_0+\nu, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu\big) \le \varphi\big(t_0+\nu, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu\big), \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

and that on Ω

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{f}'_s - \mathfrak{f}\big(s, \mathcal{Y}'_s, \mathcal{Z}'_s\big) &= -\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}\big(\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}\varphi\big)\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big) \\ &\quad -\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}} f\Big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s, \varphi\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big), (\sigma^T\nabla_x\varphi)\big(t_0+s, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big)\Big) \ge \varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}, \quad \forall\, s \in [0,\delta]. \end{aligned} \tag{9.36}$$

The first part of Proposition 7.1 or that of Proposition 7.2 implies that P-a.s., $\mathcal{Y}'_s \ge \mathcal{Y}_s$ for any $s \in [0,\delta]$. Since $\mathcal{Y}'_0 = \varphi(t_0,x_0) = u(t_0,x_0) = \widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_0 = \mathcal{Y}_0$, the second part of Proposition 7.1 or that of Proposition 7.2 further shows that $P\Big(\int_0^\delta \big(\mathfrak{f}'_s - \mathfrak{f}(s,\mathcal{Y}'_s,\mathcal{Z}'_s)\big)ds = 0\Big) > 0$. However, (9.36) and (9.34) show that P-a.s., $\int_0^\delta \Big(\mathfrak{f}'_s - \mathfrak{f}\big(s,\mathcal{Y}'_s,\mathcal{Z}'_s\big)\Big)ds \ge \varepsilon\nu > 0$, which leads to a contradiction.

2) Next, we show that u is a viscosity supersolution of (9.11). Let $(t_0,x_0,\varphi) \in (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k\times C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$ be such that $u(t_0,x_0)=\varphi(t_0,x_0)$ and that $u-\varphi$ attains a local minimum at (t_0,x_0). Since

$$u(t_0,x_0) = Y^{t_0,x_0}_{t_0} \ge L^{t_0,x_0}_{t_0} = l\big(t_0, X^{t_0,x_0}_{t_0}\big) = l(t_0,x_0),$$

it suffices to show that

$$-\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{L}\varphi(t_0,x_0) - f\big(t_0,x_0,\varphi(t_0,x_0),(\sigma^T\nabla_x\varphi)(t_0,x_0)\big) \ge 0.$$

To make a contradiction, we assume that

$$\varepsilon \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) + \mathcal{L}\varphi(t_0,x_0) + f\big(t_0,x_0,\varphi(t_0,x_0),(\sigma^T\nabla_x\varphi)(t_0,x_0)\big)\right) > 0.$$

Since $\varphi \in C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$, the continuity of functions f and σ as well as the assumption on local minimum of $u-\varphi$ assures that there exists a $\delta \in \big(0,T-t_0\big]$ such that for any $t\in[t_0,t_0+\delta]$ and any $x\in\mathbb{R}^k$ with $|x-x_0|\le\delta$, one has

$$\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t,x) + \mathcal{L}\varphi(t,x) + f\big(t,x,\varphi(t,x),(\sigma^T\nabla_x\varphi)(t,x)\big) \ge \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad (u-\varphi)(t,x) \ge 0. \tag{9.37}$$

We still define the $\mathbf{F}^{t_0}$-stopping time ν as in (9.34). It is easy to see that the processes

$$(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{V}) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{\Big(\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu\wedge s}, \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}\widetilde{Z}^{t_0,x_0}_s, \widetilde{K}^{t_0,x_0}_{\nu\wedge s}\Big)\Big\}_{s\in[0,\delta]} \in \mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}^{t_0}}[0,\delta] \times \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{H}^{2,2p}_{\mathbf{F}^{t_0}}([0,\delta];\mathbb{R}^d) \times \underset{p\in[1,\infty)}{\cap} \mathbb{K}^p_{\mathbf{F}^{t_0}}[0,\delta]$$

solves the BSDE (7.6) with generator $\hat{f} = \mathfrak{f}$ as defined in (9.35) over the period $[0,\delta]$. Let $(\mathcal{Y}',\mathcal{Z}')$ be the pair of processes considered in part 1. Proposition 9.2, (9.37) and the definition of ν imply that

$$\widetilde{Y}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu = u\big(t_0+\nu, \widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu\big) \ge \varphi\big(t_0+\nu,\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_\nu\big), \quad P\text{-a.s.},$$

and that on Ω

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{f}\big(s,\mathcal{Y}',\mathcal{Z}'\big) - \mathfrak{f}'_s \; = \; & \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}} f\Big(t_0+s,\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s, \varphi\big(t_0+s,\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big), (\sigma^T\nabla_x\varphi)\big(t_0+s,\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big)\Big) \\ & + \mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}\big(\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}\varphi\big)\big(t_0+s,\widetilde{X}^{t_0,x_0}_s\big) \ge \varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{s<\nu\}}, \quad \forall\, s\in[0,\delta].\end{aligned}$$

Using similar arguments to those that follow (9.36), we reach a contradiction. □

For the uniqueness of the viscosity solution of (9.11), we first establish a comparison principle between its viscosity subsolution and viscosity supersolution:

Lemma 9.3. *Let* $\mathfrak{a} > 0$ *and* $\zeta\in\mathbb{R}$. *If* $u \in C\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$ *is a viscosity subsolution* (*resp. viscosity supersolution*) *of* (9.11), *then*

$$\tilde{u}(t,x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta t}u(t,x), \quad \forall\,(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k$$

becomes a viscosity subsolution (*resp. viscosity supersolution*) *of the following obstacle problem of semi-linear parabolic PDE*

$$\begin{cases} \min\Big\{\tilde{u}(t,x) - \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta t}l(t,x), -\dfrac{\partial\tilde{u}}{\partial t}(t,x) - \mathcal{L}\tilde{u}(t,x) - \tilde{f}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(t,x,\tilde{u}(t,x),\nabla_x\tilde{u}(t,x)\big)\Big\} = 0, \;\; \forall\,(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k, \\ \tilde{u}(T,x) = \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta T}h(x), \;\; \forall\, x\in\mathbb{R}^k, \end{cases} \tag{9.38}$$

where $\tilde{f}_{\mathfrak{a}}(t,x,y,z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} -\zeta y + \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta t} f\Big(t,x,\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t}y, \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t}\,\sigma^T(t,x)\cdot z\Big), \;\; \forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^k.$

Proof: We first assume that u is a viscosity subsolution of (9.11). Clearly, $\tilde{u} \in C([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k)$ and $\tilde{u}(T,x) = \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta T}u(T,x) \le \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta T}h(x),\ \forall\, x\in\mathbb{R}^k$. Let $(t_0,x_0,\widetilde{\varphi}) \in (0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k\times C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$ be such that $\tilde{u}(t_0,x_0) = \widetilde{\varphi}(t_0,x_0)$ and that $\tilde{u}-\widetilde{\varphi}$ attains a local maximum at (t_0,x_0). Then

$$\varphi(t,x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t}\widetilde{\varphi}(t,x), \quad \forall\,(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k$$

is a $C^{1,2}\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$ function such that $u(t_0,x_0)=\varphi(t_0,x_0)$ and that $u-\varphi$ attains a local maximum at (t_0,x_0). Thus,

$$\min\bigg\{(u-l)(t_0,x_0), -\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{L}\varphi(t_0,x_0) - f\big(t_0,x_0,u(t_0,x_0),(\sigma^T\cdot\nabla_x\varphi)(t_0,x_0)\big)\bigg\} \le 0. \tag{9.39}$$

Suppose that $\tilde{u}(t_0,x_0) - \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta t_0}l(t_0,x_0) > 0$, or equivalently, $u(t_0,x_0)-l(t_0,x_0)>0$. By (9.39),

$$-\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{L}\varphi(t_0,x_0) - f\Big(t_0,x_0,u(t_0,x_0),(\sigma^T\cdot\nabla_x\varphi)(t_0,x_0)\Big) \le 0. \tag{9.40}$$

For any $(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^k$, one can compute that

$$\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}(t,x) = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t}\Big(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(t,x) - \zeta\widetilde{\varphi}(t,x)\Big), \quad \nabla_x\varphi(t,x) = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t}\nabla_x\widetilde{\varphi}(t,x), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}\varphi(t,x) = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t}\mathcal{L}\widetilde{\varphi}(t,x).$$

Plugging them into (9.40) yields that

$$-\frac{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) + \zeta\tilde{u}(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{L}\widetilde{\varphi}(t_0,x_0) - \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta t_0}f\Big(t_0,x_0,\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t_0}\tilde{u}(t_0,x_0),\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}e^{-\zeta t_0}(\sigma^T\cdot\nabla_x\widetilde{\varphi})(t_0,x_0)\Big) \le 0.$$

Hence, we have

$$\min\bigg\{\tilde{u}(t_0,x_0) - \mathfrak{a}e^{\zeta t_0}l(t_0,x_0), -\frac{\partial\widetilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{L}\widetilde{\varphi}(t_0,x_0) - \tilde{f}\Big(t_0,x_0,\tilde{u}(t_0,x_0),\nabla_x\widetilde{\varphi}(t_0,x_0)\Big)\bigg\} \le 0,$$

which means that $\tilde{u}$ is a viscosity subsolution of (9.38). For the case of viscosity supersolution, we can argue similarly. □

Inspired by Theorem 3.1 of [7], we have the following comparison theorem, which together with Theorem 9.1 shows that (9.11) admits a unique viscosity solution.

Theorem 9.2. *Suppose that there exists an increasing function* $\mathfrak{M}:(0,\infty)\to(0,\infty)$ *such that for any* $R>0$,

$$\big|f(t,x,y,z) - f(t,x',y,z)\big| \le \mathfrak{M}(R)\big(1+|z|\big)|x-x'| \tag{9.41}$$

holds for any $(t,x,x',y,z)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{R}^k\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *with* $|x|\vee|x'|\vee|y|\le R$. *Let* $u\in C\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)$ $\Big($*resp.* $v\in C\big([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k\big)\Big)$ *be a viscosity subsolution* (*resp. viscosity supersolution*) *of* (9.11) *such that for some* $\widetilde{\kappa}>0$,

$$|u(t,x)|\vee|v(t,x)| \le \widetilde{\kappa}(1+|x|^{\varpi}), \quad \forall\,(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k. \tag{9.42}$$

Then $u(t,x)\le v(t,x)$ *for all* $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k$.

Proof: For any $\theta\in(0,1]$, we define

$$\tilde{u}_\theta(t,x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \theta e^{\kappa t}u(t,x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_\theta(t,x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \theta e^{\kappa t}v(t,x), \quad \forall\,(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^k.$$

Lemma 9.3 shows that $\tilde{u}_\theta$ (resp. $\tilde{v}_\theta$) is a viscosity subsolution (resp. viscosity supersolution) of (9.38) with $(\mathfrak{a},\zeta)=(\theta,\kappa)$.

Let $\lambda \stackrel{\triangle}{=} 8(b_0+\kappa) + 4(1+4\gamma e)\sigma_*^2 + 2(\alpha+4\kappa\widetilde{\kappa})e^{\kappa T}$. Suppose that we have proven the following statement:

$$\begin{array}{c}\text{For any } [T_1,T_2]\subset[0,T] \text{ with } T_2-T_1\le\frac{1}{\lambda}, \text{ if } u(T_2,x)\le v(T_2,x),\ \forall\,x\in\mathbb{R}^k, \text{ then}\\ u(t,x)\le v(t,x),\ \forall\,(t,x)\in[T_1,T_2]\times\mathbb{R}^k.\end{array} \tag{9.43}$$

Set $N \triangleq \lceil \lambda T \rceil$ and $t_i \triangleq i\frac{T}{N}$, for $i = 0, 1, \cdots, N$. Since $u(T,x) \le h(x) \le v(T,x)$, $\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, (9.43) shows that $u(t,x) \le v(t,x)$, $\forall\, (t,x) \in [t_{N-1}, t_N] \times \mathbb{R}^k$, in particular, $u(t_{N-1},x) \le v(t_{N-1},x)$, $\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Again by (9.43), we have $u(t,x) \le v(t,x)$, $\forall\, (t,x) \in [t_{N-2}, t_{N-1}] \times \mathbb{R}^k$, in particular, $u(t_{N-2},x) \le v(t_{N-2},x)$, $\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Iteratively, one can show that $u(t,x) \le v(t,x)$ for all $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k$. Therefore, it suffices to show (9.43).

Assume that (9.43) does not hold, i.e., there exists a time interval $[T_1, T_2] \subset [0,T]$ with $T_2 - T_1 \le \frac{1}{\lambda}$ such that $u(T_2,x) \le v(T_2,x)$, $\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and that $u(\hat{t},\hat{x}) - v(\hat{t},\hat{x}) > \delta$ for some $(\hat{t},\hat{x}) \in [T_1, T_2) \times \mathbb{R}^k$ and some $\delta > 0$. By the continuity of functions u and v, we may assume that $\hat{t} > T_1$.

We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1: The mapping $z \to f(t,x,y,z)$ is convex for all $(t,x,y) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$.

We fix a $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\big|e^{\kappa \hat{t}} u(\hat{t},\hat{x})\big| \vee \big|e^{\kappa \hat{t}} v(\hat{t},\hat{x})\big| \vee e^{\lambda(T_2 - \hat{t})}(1 + 2|\hat{x}|^2) < \frac{\delta}{4(1-\theta)}, \tag{9.44}$$

and fix a $\varrho \in \big(0, \frac{\delta}{4}(\hat{t} - T_1)\big)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(t,x,x') \triangleq \frac{\varrho}{t - T_1} + e^{\lambda(T_2 - t)}\left(\frac{|x - x'|^2}{\varepsilon} + (1-\theta)(1 + |x|^2 + |x'|^2)\right) \qquad \forall\, t \in (T_1, T_2],\ \forall\, x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^k,$$

$$\text{and} \quad M_\varepsilon \triangleq \sup_{(t,x,x') \in (T_1,T_2] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k} \big\{\tilde{u}_1(t,x) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t,x') - \Phi_\varepsilon(t,x,x')\big\}.$$

Since $r^2 \ge \dfrac{4\widetilde{\kappa} e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}(1 + r^{\varpi})$ holds for any $r \ge R_\theta \triangleq 1 \vee \left(\dfrac{8\widetilde{\kappa} e^{\kappa T}}{1-\theta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2-\varpi}}$, (9.42) shows that for any $(t,x,x') \in [T_1, T_2] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k$ with $|x| \vee |x'| \ge R_\theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_1(t,x) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t,x') &\le e^{\kappa T}\big(|u(t,x)| + |v(t,x')|\big) \le 2\widetilde{\kappa} e^{\kappa T}\big(1 + (|x| \vee |x'|)^{\varpi}\big) \le \frac{1}{2}(1-\theta)\big(|x| \vee |x'|\big)^2 \\ &\le \frac{1}{2} e^{\lambda(T_2 - t)}(1-\theta)\big(1 + |x|^2 + |x'|^2\big), \end{aligned} \tag{9.45}$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{\frac{1}{t-T_1} \vee |x| \vee |x'| \to \infty} \big(\tilde{u}_1(t,x) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t,x') - \Phi_\varepsilon(t,x,x')\big) = -\infty.$$

Hence, one can deduce that the supremum M_ε is finite and attainable at some $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, x'_\varepsilon) \in (T_1, T_2] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k$. Then it follows from (9.44) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_1(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t_\varepsilon, x'_\varepsilon) - \Phi_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, x'_\varepsilon) = M_\varepsilon &\ge \tilde{u}_1(\hat{t},\hat{x}) - \tilde{v}_\theta(\hat{t},\hat{x}) - \frac{\varrho}{\hat{t} - T_1} - e^{\lambda(T_2 - \hat{t})}(1-\theta)(1 + 2|\hat{x}|^2) \\ &\ge u(\hat{t},\hat{x}) - v(\hat{t},\hat{x}) + (1-\theta)e^{\kappa \hat{t}}\, v(\hat{t},\hat{x}) - \frac{\varrho}{\hat{t} - T_1} - e^{\lambda(T_2 - \hat{t})}(1-\theta)(1 + 2|\hat{x}|^2) > \frac{\delta}{4}, \end{aligned} \tag{9.46}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\delta}{4} + e^{\lambda(T_2 - t)}\left(\frac{|x_\varepsilon - x'_\varepsilon|^2}{\varepsilon} + (1-\theta)\big(1 + |x_\varepsilon|^2 + |x'_\varepsilon|^2\big)\right) < \tilde{u}_1(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t_\varepsilon, x'_\varepsilon). \tag{9.47}$$

Hence, we see from (9.45) that

$$|x_\varepsilon| \vee |x'_\varepsilon| < R_\theta. \tag{9.48}$$

As $\Big\{(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, x'_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon > 0\Big\} \subset (T_1, T_2] \times B_{R_\theta}(0) \times B_{R_\theta}(0)$, we can pick up a sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \infty)$ with $\lim\limits_{n \to \infty} \downarrow \varepsilon_n = 0$ such that the sequence $\big\{(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $(t_*, x_*, x'_*) \in [T_1, T_2] \times \overline{B}_{R_\theta}(0) \times \overline{B}_{R_\theta}(0)$. Then (9.46) and the continuity of function u and v imply that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\varrho}{t_{\varepsilon_n} - T_1} \le \varlimsup_{n \to \infty} \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}) \le \tilde{u}_1(t_*, x_*) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t_*, x'_*) - \frac{\delta}{4} < \infty,$$

which implies that $t_* = \lim_{n\to\infty} t_{\varepsilon_n} > T_1$, i.e., $t_* \in (T_1, T_2]$.

One can also deduce from (9.47) that

$$\overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{|x_{\varepsilon_n} - x'_{\varepsilon_n}|^2}{\varepsilon_n} \le \tilde{u}_1(t_*, x_*) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t_*, x'_*) < \infty,$$

which leads to that $\lim_{n\to\infty} |x_{\varepsilon_n} - x'_{\varepsilon_n}| = 0$, namely, $x_* = x'_*$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_1(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}) - \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}) &= M_{\varepsilon_n} \\ &\ge \tilde{u}_1(t_*, x_*) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t_*, x_*) - \frac{\varrho}{t_* - T_1} - e^{\lambda(T_2 - t_*)}(1-\theta)(1+2|x_*|^2).\end{aligned}$$

As $n \to \infty$, the continuity of functions u and v implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|x_{\varepsilon_n} - x'_{\varepsilon_n}|^2}{\varepsilon_n} = 0. \tag{9.49}$$

Now we claim that

$$\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ has a subsequence } \{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ such that for any } n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ either } t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n} = T_2 \text{ or } u(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}, x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}) \le l(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}, x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}). \tag{9.50}$$

Assume the contrary. Then there exists an $n^o \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \ge n^o$, $t_{\varepsilon_n} \in (T_1, T_2)$ and $u(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}) > l(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n})$.

Fix $n \ge n^o$. The continuity of functions u and l shows that $(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n})$ has an open neighborhood $\mathcal{O}_n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} (t_{\varepsilon_n} - r_n, t_{\varepsilon_n} + r_n) \times B_{r_n}(x_{\varepsilon_n}) \subset (T_1, T_2) \times \mathbb{R}^k$ for some $r_n > 0$ such that $u(t,x) > l(t,x)$ for any $(t,x) \in \mathcal{O}_n$. Then $\tilde{u}(t,x)$ becomes a viscosity subsolution of (9.38) without obstacle and terminal condition over $\mathcal{O}_n$, i.e.

$$-\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial t}(t,x) - \mathcal{L}\tilde{u}(t,x) + \kappa \tilde{u}(t,x) - e^{\kappa t} f\Big(t, x, e^{-\kappa t}\tilde{u}(t,x), e^{-\kappa t}(\sigma^T \cdot \nabla_x \tilde{u})(t,x)\Big) = 0, \ \ \forall\, (t,x) \in \mathcal{O}_n. \tag{9.51}$$

As $\tilde{v}_\theta$ is a viscosity supersolution of (9.38), it is clearly a viscosity supersolution of (9.38) without obstacle and terminal condition over $(0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^k$ $\big($thus over $\mathcal{O}'_n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} (t_{\varepsilon_n} - r_n, t_{\varepsilon_n} + r_n) \times B_{r_n}(x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big)$, i.e.

$$-\frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial t}(t,x) - \mathcal{L}\tilde{v}(t,x) + \kappa \tilde{v}(t,x) - \theta e^{\kappa t} f\Big(t, x, \tfrac{1}{\theta} e^{-\kappa t}\tilde{v}(t,x), \tfrac{1}{\theta} e^{-\kappa t}(\sigma^T \cdot \nabla_x \tilde{v})(t,x)\Big) = 0, \ \ \forall\, (t,x) \in \mathcal{O}'_n. \tag{9.52}$$

Since the mapping $(t,x,x') \to \tilde{u}_1(t,x) - \tilde{v}_\theta(t,x') - \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t,x,x')$ is maximized at $(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n})$ over $(T_1, T_2] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k$ $\big($thus over $(t_{\varepsilon_n} - r_n, t_{\varepsilon_n} + r_n) \times B_{r_n}(x_{\varepsilon_n}) \times B_{r_n}(x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big)$, Theorem 8.3 of [6] shows that there exist $p_n, p'_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $W_n, W'_n \in \mathbb{S}^k$ such that

$$\big(p_n, \nabla_x \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}), W_n\big) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+} \tilde{u}_1(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), \tag{9.53}$$

$$\big(p'_n, -\nabla_{x'} \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}), W'_n\big) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-} \tilde{v}_\theta(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}), \tag{9.54}$$

$$p_n - p'_n = \frac{\partial \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}}{\partial t}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}) = -\frac{\varrho}{(t_{\varepsilon_n} - T_1)^2} - \lambda \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), \tag{9.55}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} W_n & 0 \\ 0 & -W'_n \end{pmatrix} \le D^2_{x,x'} \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}) + \varepsilon_n^3 \Big(D^2_{x,x'} \Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n})\Big)^2. \tag{9.56}$$

As $\tilde{u}_1$ is a viscosity subsolution of (9.51), one can deduce from (9.53) that

$$\begin{aligned}&-p_n - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}\big(W_n \cdot (\sigma\sigma^T)(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n})\big) - 2e^{\lambda(T_2 - t_{\varepsilon_n})}\Big\langle b(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), \frac{x_{\varepsilon_n} - x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n} + (1-\theta)x_{\varepsilon_n}\Big\rangle + \kappa e^{\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}} u(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}) \\ &\quad - e^{\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}} f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, u(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), 2e^{-\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n} + \lambda(T_2 - t_{\varepsilon_n})} \sigma^T(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}) \cdot \left(\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n} - x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n} + (1-\theta)x_{\varepsilon_n}\right)\right) \le 0.\end{aligned} \tag{9.57}$$

Since $\tilde{v}_\theta$ is a viscosity supersolution of (9.52), it follows from (9.54) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-p'_n-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}\big(W'_n\cdot(\sigma\sigma^T)(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big)-2e^{\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\left\langle b(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\,\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}-(1-\theta)x'_{\varepsilon_n}\right\rangle+\theta\kappa e^{\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}}\,v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\\
&\quad-\theta e^{\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}} f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\frac{2}{\theta}e^{-\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}+\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\sigma^T(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\cdot\left(\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}-(1-\theta)x'_{\varepsilon_n}\right)\right)\ge 0. \qquad (9.58)
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting (9.58) from (9.57), we see from (9.55) that

$$\frac{\varrho}{(t_{\varepsilon_n}-T_1)^2}+\lambda\Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\le I^1_n+2e^{\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}I^2_n+e^{\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}}\sum_{j=3}^{6}I^j_n, \qquad (9.59)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I^1_n &\triangleq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}\big(W_n\cdot(\sigma\sigma^T)(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\big)-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{trace}\big(W'_n\cdot(\sigma\sigma^T)(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big),\\
I^2_n &\triangleq \left\langle b(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-b(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}\right\rangle+(1-\theta)\Big(\big\langle b(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n}),x_{\varepsilon_n}\big\rangle+\big\langle b(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),x'_{\varepsilon_n}\big\rangle\Big),\\
I^3_n &\triangleq -\kappa u(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})+\theta\kappa v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\\
I^4_n &\triangleq \Big[f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n},u(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n}),J_n\Big)-f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),J_n\Big)\Big], \quad\text{with}\\
&\qquad J_n\triangleq 2e^{-\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}+\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\sigma^T(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\cdot\left(\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}+(1-\theta)x_{\varepsilon_n}\right),\\
I^5_n &\triangleq \Big[f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),J_n\Big)-f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),J_n\Big)\Big],\\
I^6_n &\triangleq f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),J_n\Big)-\theta f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\frac{1}{\theta}J'_n\right), \quad\text{with}\\
&\qquad J'_n\triangleq 2e^{-\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}+\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\sigma^T(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\cdot\left(\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}-(1-\theta)x'_{\varepsilon_n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

- One can deduce from (9.56) and (9.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
I^1_n &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\\ \sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\end{pmatrix}^T\begin{pmatrix}W_n & 0\\ 0 & -W'_n\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\\ \sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\end{pmatrix}\\
&\le \Big(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}e^{\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}+4\varepsilon_n e^{2\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}+4\varepsilon_n^2(1-\theta)e^{2\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\Big)\big|\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big|^2\\
&\quad+\Big((1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}+2\varepsilon_n^3(1-\theta)^2e^{2\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\Big)\Big(\big|\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\big|^2+\big|\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big|^2\Big)\\
&\le e\kappa^2\frac{|x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}|^2}{\varepsilon_n}+2(1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}\sigma_*^2+c_{\sigma_*}\big(\varepsilon_n+\varepsilon_n^2+\varepsilon_n^3\big). \qquad (9.60)
\end{aligned}$$

- It follows from (9.1) that

$$I^2_n\le\kappa\frac{|x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}|^2}{\varepsilon_n}+(1-\theta)\big(b_0|x_{\varepsilon_n}|+b_0|x'_{\varepsilon_n}|+\kappa|x_{\varepsilon_n}|^2+\kappa|x'_{\varepsilon_n}|^2\big). \qquad (9.61)$$

- We see from (9.47) that $u(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-\theta v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})>0$. Then (9.3) shows that

$$I^4_n\le\kappa\big|u(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big|\le\kappa\big(u(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-\theta v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big)+\kappa(1-\theta)\big|v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big|.$$

Thus,

$$I^3_n+I^4_n\le\kappa(1-\theta)\big|v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\big|. \qquad (9.62)$$

- (9.48) and (9.42) imply that $\sup\limits_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\big\{|x_{\varepsilon_i}|\vee|x'_{\varepsilon_i}|\vee\big|v(t_{\varepsilon_i},x'_{\varepsilon_i})\big|\big\}\le\widetilde{R}_\theta\overset{\triangle}{=}(1\vee\widetilde{\kappa})\big(1+R_\theta^{\varpi}\big)$. Then (9.41) shows that

$$I_n^5\le\mathfrak{M}(\widetilde{R}_\theta)\big(1+|J_n|\big)|x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}|\le\mathfrak{M}(\widetilde{R}_\theta)\Big(1+2e\sigma_*\frac{|x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}|}{\varepsilon_n}+2e\sigma_*R_\theta\Big)|x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}|. \tag{9.63}$$

- The convexity of the mapping $z\to f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),z\Big)$, (9.3) implies that

$$I_n^6\ \le\ (1-\theta)f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\frac{J_n-J'_n}{1-\theta}\right)\le(1-\theta)f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n},0,\frac{J_n-J'_n}{1-\theta}\right)+\kappa(1-\theta)|v(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})|,$$

where

$$\frac{J_n-J'_n}{1-\theta}=\frac{2e^{-\kappa t_{\varepsilon_n}+\lambda(T_2-t_{\varepsilon_n})}}{1-\theta}\bigg(\Big\langle\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\frac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}\Big\rangle+(1-\theta)\Big(\sigma^T(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})\cdot x_{\varepsilon_n}+\sigma^T(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n})\cdot x'_{\varepsilon_n}\Big)\bigg).$$

Since $\left|\Big\langle\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x_{\varepsilon_n})-\sigma(t_{\varepsilon_n},x'_{\varepsilon_n}),\dfrac{x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}}{\varepsilon_n}\Big\rangle\right|\le\kappa\dfrac{|x_{\varepsilon_n}-x'_{\varepsilon_n}|^2}{\varepsilon_n}$, (9.49) and the continuity of function σ that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{J_n-J'_n}{1-\theta}=4e^{-\kappa t_*+\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\sigma^T(t_*,x_*)\cdot x_*. \tag{9.64}$$

Letting $n\to\infty$ in (9.59) and using the continuity of all functions involved, we can deduce from (9.49), (9.60) through (9.64) that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_*)}(1+2|x_*|^2)\le 2(1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\sigma_*^2+4(1-\theta)(b_0+\kappa)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\big(1+|x_*|^2\big)+2\kappa e^{\kappa t_*}(1-\theta)\big|v(t_*,x_*)\big|\\ +e^{\kappa t_*}(1-\theta)f\Big(t_*,x_*,0,4e^{-\kappa t_*+\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\sigma^T(t_*,x_*)\cdot x_*\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{9.65}$$

Conditions (9.42) and (9.3) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}&2\kappa e^{\kappa t_*}\big|v(t_*,x_*)\big|+e^{\kappa t_*}f\Big(t_*,x_*,0,4e^{-\kappa t_*+\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\sigma^T(t_*,x_*)\cdot x_*\Big)\\ &\quad\le 2\kappa\widetilde{\kappa}e^{\kappa t_*}(1+|x_*|^{\varpi})+e^{\kappa t_*}\Big(\alpha+8\gamma e^{-2\kappa t_*+2\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\sigma_*^2|x_*|^2\Big)\\ &\quad\le(\alpha+4\kappa\widetilde{\kappa})e^{\kappa T}(1+|x_*|^2)+8\gamma e^{-\kappa t_*+1+\lambda(T_2-t_*)}\sigma_*^2|x_*|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Plugging it back into (9.65) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_*)}(1+2|x_*|^2)\ &\le\ (1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_*)}(1+|x_*|^2)\Big(4(b_0+\kappa)+2(1+4\gamma e)\sigma_*^2+(\alpha+4\kappa\widetilde{\kappa})e^{\kappa T}\Big)\\ &=\ \frac{1}{2}\lambda(1-\theta)e^{\lambda(T_2-t_*)}(1+2|x_*|^2),\end{aligned}$$

which results in a contradiction. Thus we proved claim (9.50). Let $\{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the subsequence of $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ as described in (9.50). For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, since the maximum is attained at $(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x'_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})$,

$$\tilde{u}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\theta\tilde{v}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\frac{\varrho}{\hat{t}-T_1}-e^{\lambda(T_2-\hat{t})}(1-\theta)(1+2|\hat{x}|^2)\le M_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}\le\tilde{u}(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})-\theta\tilde{v}(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x'_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}). \tag{9.66}$$

If $t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}=T_2$, $u(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})=u(T_2,x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})\le v(T_2,x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})=v(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})$ by our condition. Otherwise, $t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}\in(T_1,T_2)$ and $u(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})\le l(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})$. As v is a viscosity supersolution of (9.11), we always have $v(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})-l(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})\ge 0$. Thus we still have $u(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})\le v(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})$. Then (9.66) reduces to

$$\tilde{u}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\theta\tilde{v}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\frac{\varrho}{\hat{t}-T_1}-e^{\lambda(T_2-\hat{t})}(1-\theta)(1+2|\hat{x}|^2)\le\tilde{v}(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n})-\theta\tilde{v}(t_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n},x'_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_n}).$$

As $n\to\infty$, we obtain

$$\tilde{u}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\theta\tilde{v}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\frac{\varrho}{\hat{t}-T_1}-e^{\lambda(T_2-\hat{t})}(1-\theta)(1+2|\hat{x}|^2)\le(1-\theta)\tilde{v}(t_*,x_*).$$

Letting $\varrho \to 0$ and letting $\theta \to 1$ yield that $\tilde{u}(\hat{t},\hat{x})-\tilde{v}(\hat{t},\hat{x}) \le 0$, thus $u(\hat{t},\hat{x}) \le v(\hat{t},\hat{x})$, which contradicts with our initial assumption. Therefore, (9.43) holds.

Case 2: The mapping $z \to f(t,x,y,z)$ is concave for all $(t,x,y) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$.

This case is similar to Case 1, so we only sketch out the main differences: We redefine

$$M_\varepsilon \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{(t,x,x') \in (T_1,T_2] \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k} \big\{ \tilde{u}_\theta(t,x) - \tilde{v}_1(t,x') - \Phi_\varepsilon(t,x,x') \big\}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and change the forms of I_n^3 through I_n^6 correspondingly. For example,

$$I_n^6 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \theta f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, u(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), \frac{1}{\theta} J_n \right) - f\big(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, u(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), J'_n\big).$$

Then the concavity of the mapping $z \to f\Big(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}, u(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x_{\varepsilon_n}), z\Big)$ implies that

$$I_n^6 \le -(1-\theta) f\left(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}, v(t_{\varepsilon_n}, x'_{\varepsilon_n}), \frac{J'_n - J_n}{1-\theta} \right).$$

All other arguments used in Case 1 still work in this case with slight adaptions. □

Remark 9.1. *Theorem 9.2 is not a simple extension of Theorem 3.1 of [7]. In fact, there are two gaps in the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [7]: In their setting of* $\tilde{u}^\mu(x,t) = \mu e^{-Lt} u(x,t) + C(1+|x|^p)$ *(given that* $|u(x,t)| \le C\big(1+|x|^p\big)$ *for some* $p > 1$*),* L *is required by their Lemma 3.4 to be dependent on* $\mu \in (0,1)$*, see* (A.9)*. This causes a trouble when letting* $\mu \to 1$ *in* $\mu\tilde{u} - \tilde{v} \le 0$ *(or equivalently in* (A.12)*) to obtain* $u \le v$*, see (1) of Subsection A.3. Another gap is still due to Lemma 3.4 of [7], see (2) of Subsection A.3. In our proof of Theorem 9.2, we set* $\tilde{u}_\theta(t,x) = \theta e^{\kappa t} u(t,x)$*,* $\theta \in (0,1)$*. Clearly, the constant* κ*, assumed in* (9.1)-(9.3)*, is independent on* θ*. Moreover, since* $\tilde{u}_\theta$ *does not contain the term* $C(1+|x|^\varpi)$ *as in* $\tilde{u}^\mu$*, we do not need to derive and use the counterparts to Lemma 3.2-3.4 of [7].*

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of (3.14)

Lemma A.1. *Let* $\mathbb{B}$ *be a generic Banach space with norm* $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{B}}$ *and let* $p,q \in [1,\infty)$*. If* $\big\{X^n\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is a sequence of* $\mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}\big([0,T];\mathbb{B}\big)$ *such that it holds* $dt \otimes dP$*-a.e. that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} X^n_t = X_t \quad \textit{and} \quad |X^n_t|_{\mathbb{B}} \le \mathcal{X}_t, \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N} \tag{A.1}$$

for some $\mathbb{B}$*-valued,* $\mathbf{F}$*-adapted process* X *and some* $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}\big([0,T];\mathbb{R}\big)$*, then* $X \in \mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}\big([0,T];\mathbb{B}\big)$ *and* $\|X\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})} = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \|X^n\|_{\mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{B})}$*.*

Proof: We assume that except on a P-null set $\mathscr{N}_1$, (A.1) holds for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$. Since $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{L}^{p,q}_{\mathbf{F}}\big([0,T];\mathbb{R}\big)$, it holds except on another P-null set $\mathscr{N}_2$ that

$$\Big(\int_0^T \mathcal{X}^p_t dt\Big)^{\frac{q}{p}} < \infty, \quad \text{thus} \quad \int_0^T \mathcal{X}^p_t dt < \infty.$$

For any $\omega \in \mathscr{N}_1^c \cap \mathscr{N}_2^c$, since it holds for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ that

$$\big|X_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \big|X^n_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}} \quad \text{and} \quad \big|X^n_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}} \le \big(\mathcal{X}_t(\omega)\big)^p, \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{A.2}$$

the Dominated Convergence Theorem implies that

$$\int_0^T \big|X_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\, dt = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T \big|X^n_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\, dt.$$

It also follows from (A.2) that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\int_0^T \big|X^n_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\, dt \le \int_0^T \big(\mathcal{X}_t(\omega)\big)^p dt, \quad \text{thus} \quad \bigg(\int_0^T \big|X^n_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\, dt\bigg)^{\frac{q}{p}} \le \bigg(\int_0^T \big(\mathcal{X}_t(\omega)\big)^p dt\bigg)^{\frac{q}{p}}.$$

Applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem once again yields that

$$E\Bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big|X_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\, dt\bigg)^{\frac{q}{p}}\Bigg] = \lim_{n\to\infty} E\Bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big|X^n_t(\omega)\big|^p_{\mathbb{B}}\, dt\bigg)^{\frac{q}{p}}\Bigg] \le E\Bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big(\mathcal{X}_t(\omega)\big)^p dt\bigg)^{\frac{q}{p}}\Bigg] < \infty. \qquad \square$$

Now, let us prove (3.14). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have seen from (3.10) that $\Big\{\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m - Y^n)\big|}\big(Z^m - Z^n\big)\Big\}_{m \ge n} \subset \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. As $m \to \infty$ in (3.3), the continuity of function ϕ' implies that P-a.s.

$$\big|\phi'(Y_t - Y^n_t)\big| \le e^{\lambda_o \gamma(\mathscr{L}_t + \mathscr{Y}_t)}, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{A.3}$$

Similar to (3.6), applying Young's inequality with $p_1 = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_o}$, $p_2 = \frac{\lambda'}{\lambda_o}$ and $p_3 = p_o$, we can deduce from (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} &E\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|\, |Z_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds \\ &\quad \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'} E\Bigg[e^{\lambda_o p_1 \gamma \mathscr{L}_*} + e^{\lambda_o p_2 \gamma \mathscr{Y}_*} + \bigg(\int_0^T |Z_s - Z^n_s|^2 ds\bigg)^{p_o}\Bigg] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\Xi + c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\, E\Bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\bigg)^{p_o}\Bigg] < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y - Y^n)\big|}\big(Z - Z^n\big) \in \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. (Note that since Y^n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are $\mathbf{F}$-adapted continuous processes, $Y = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} Y^n$ is at least an $\mathbf{F}$-predictable process.)

For any $X \in \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have seen from (3.5) that $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_o} = 1$, or equivalently $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + 1 = 2 - \frac{1}{p_o}$. Applying Young's inequality with $q_1 = p_1\big(2 - \frac{1}{p_o}\big)$, $q_2 = p_2\big(2 - \frac{1}{p_o}\big)$ and $q_3 = 2 - \frac{1}{p_o}$, we see from (A.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} &E\Bigg[\bigg(\int_0^T \big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|\, \big|X_s\big|^2 ds\bigg)^{\frac{p_o}{2p_o - 1}}\Bigg] \\ &\qquad \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'} E\Bigg[e^{\frac{\lambda_o p_o}{2p_o-1} q_1 \gamma \mathscr{L}_*} + e^{\frac{\lambda_o p_o}{2p_o-1} q_2 \gamma \mathscr{Y}_*} + \int_0^T \big|X_s\big|^2 ds\Bigg] \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\Xi + c_{\lambda,\lambda'} E\int_0^T \big|X_s\big|^2 ds < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which means that $X\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y - Y^n)\big|} \in \mathbb{H}^{2,\frac{2p_o}{2p_o-1}}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since the sequence $\{Z^m\}_{m\ge n}$ weakly converges to Z in $\mathbb{H}^{2,2p_o}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$, it follows that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} E\int_0^T X_s \sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|}\, (Z_s - Z^m_s)\, ds = 0. \tag{A.4}$$

On the other hand, for any $m \ge n$ Hölder's inequality and (3.2) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bigg|E\int_0^T X_s\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|} - \sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m_s - Y^n_s)\big|}\right)\big(Z^m_s - Z^n_s\big) ds\bigg| \\ &\qquad \le \left\|\big|X_s\big|\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|} - \sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m_s - Y^n_s)\big|}\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2,\frac{2p_o}{2p_o-1}}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R})} \|Z^m - Z^n\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2,2p_o}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\qquad \le c_{\lambda,\lambda'}\, \Xi^{\frac{1}{2p_o}} \left\|\big|X_s\big|\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s - Y^n_s)\big|} - \sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m_s - Y^n_s)\big|}\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2,\frac{2p_o}{2p_o-1}}_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R})}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

It follows from (3.8) that P-a.s.

$$0 \le \big|X_t\big|\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_t - Y^n_t)\big|} - \sqrt{\phi'\big|(Y^m_t - Y^n_t)\big|}\right) \le \big|X_t\big|\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_t - Y^n_t)\big|}, \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T], \ \forall\, m \ge n.$$

Since $|X|\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y-Y^n)\big|} \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,\frac{2p_o}{2p_o-1}}([0,T];\mathbb{R})$, one can deduce from the continuity of function ϕ' and Lemma A.1 that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\left\| |X_s|\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s-Y^n_s)\big|}-\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m_s-Y^n_s)\big|}\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{F}}^{2,\frac{2p_o}{2p_o-1}}([0,T];\mathbb{R})}=0,$$

which together with (A.5) implies that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}E\int_0^T X_s\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s-Y^n_s)\big|}-\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m_s-Y^n_s)\big|}\right)\big(Z^m_s-Z^n_s\big)ds=0.$$

Adding this limit to that in (A.4) yields that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}E\int_0^T X_s\left(\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y_s-Y^n_s)\big|}\big(Z_s-Z^n_s\big)-\sqrt{\big|\phi'(Y^m_s-Y^n_s)\big|}\big(Z^m_s-Z^n_s\big)\right)ds=0.$$

Thus (3.14) follows. □

A.2 Comparison Theorem for Quadratic RBSDEs with Bounded Obstacles

Proposition A.1. *Let* (ξ_1,f_1,L^1), (ξ_2,f_2,L^2) *be two parameter sets such that*

(i) For $j=1,2$, $(\xi_j,L^j)\in\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)\times\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ *and* f_i *satisfy* (4.1)*;*

(ii) It holds P*-a.s. that* $\xi_1\le\xi_2$ *and that* $L^1_t\le L^2_t$, $\forall\, t\in[0,T]$*;*

(iii) For some $\gamma>0$ *and some function* $\ell:\mathbb{R}\to(0,\infty)$ *with* $\int_0^\infty\frac{dx}{\ell(x)}=\infty$*, it holds* $dt\otimes dP$*-a.e. that*

$$-\,\ell(y)-\frac{\gamma}{2}|z|^2\le f_1(t,\omega,y,z)\le f_2(t,\omega,y,z)\le\ell(y)+\frac{\gamma}{2}|z|^2,\quad\forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{A.6}$$

If for $j=1,2$, $(Y^j,Z^j,K^j)\in\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]\times\mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]$ *be the maximal bounded solution of the RBSDE*(ξ_j,f_j,L^j) *in the sense of Theorem 1 in [14], then it holds* P*-a.s. that* $Y^1_t\le Y^2_t$ *for any* $t\in[0,T]$.

Proof: Fix $j\in\{1,2\}$. Let us first recall the construction of the maximal bounded solution (Y^j,Z^j,K^j) of the RBSDE(ξ_j,f_j,L^j) from [14]. Since $\int_0^\infty\frac{dx}{\ell(x)}=\infty$, Lemma 1 of [16] shows that there exists a unique solution $u^i:[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ to the following backward ordinary differential equation (BODE for short):

$$u^j(t)=b_j+\int_t^T\ell\big(u^j(s)\big)\,ds,\quad t\in[0,T],$$

where $b_j\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\|\xi_j\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)}\vee\|L^j\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}$. Correspondingly, $\widetilde{u}^i(t)\stackrel{\triangle}{=}e^{\gamma u^i(t)}$, $t\in[0,T]$, uniquely solves the BODE:

$$\widetilde{u}^j(t)=e^{\gamma b_j}+\int_t^T\widetilde{\ell}\big(\widetilde{u}^j(s)\big)\,ds,\quad t\in[0,T],$$

where $\widetilde{\ell}(y)\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\mathbf{1}_{\{y>0\}}\gamma y\,\ell\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\ln y\right)$, $\forall\,y\in\mathbb{R}$.

Let $\psi:\mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ be a smooth function that equals to 1 inside $[r,R]$ and vanishes outside $(r/2,2R)$ with $r\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\frac{1}{2}\exp\big\{-\gamma\big(\|L^1\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\vee\|L^2\|_{\mathbb{C}^\infty_{\mathbf{F}}[0,T]}\big)\big\}$ and $R\stackrel{\triangle}{=}2\left(\widetilde{u}^1(0)\vee\widetilde{u}^2(0)\right)$. Clearly, the function

$$F^j_\psi(t,\omega,y,z)\stackrel{\triangle}{=}\psi(y)\left\{\gamma y f_j\left(t,\omega,\frac{\ln y}{\gamma},\frac{z}{\gamma y}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\frac{|z|^2}{y}\right\},\quad\forall\,(t,\omega,y,z)\in[0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$$

is $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable and satisfies (4.1). By (A.6), it holds $dt\otimes dP$-a.e. that

$$-\widetilde{\ell}(y)-\frac{2}{r}|z|^2\le F^j_\psi(t,\omega,y,z)\le\widetilde{\ell}(y),\quad\forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d.$$

Hence $F^j_\psi(\cdot,\cdot,\rho(\cdot),\cdot)$ can be approximated by the following decreasing sequence of functions: For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$F^{j,n}_\psi(t,\omega,y,z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \widetilde{\ell}\big(\rho(y)\big)\big(1-\pi_n(z)\big) + \pi_n(z)F^j_\psi\big(t,\omega,\rho(y),z\big), \quad \forall\,(t,\omega,y,z) \in [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\rho : \mathbb{R} \to (0,\infty)$ and $\pi_n : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ are two smooth functions such that

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} r/2, & \text{if } x < r/2, \\ x, & \text{if } r \le x \le R, \\ 2R, & \text{if } x > 2R, \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \pi_n(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |z| \le n, \\ 0, & \text{if } |z| \ge n+1. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $F^{j,n}_\psi$ is also $\mathscr{P}\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)/\mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable and satisfies (4.1). Since it holds P-a.s. that

$$\begin{aligned} -\widetilde{\ell}\big(\rho(y)\big) - \frac{2}{r}(n+1)^2 \;&\le\; \widetilde{\ell}\big(\rho(y)\big)\big(1-2\pi_{n+1}(z)\big) - \frac{2}{r}|z|^2\pi_{n+1}(z) \\ &\le\; F^{j,n+1}_\psi(t,\omega,y,z) \le F^{j,n}_\psi(t,\omega,y,z) \le \widetilde{\ell}\big(\rho(y)\big), \quad \forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned}$$

we further see that $F^{j,n}_\psi$ is a bounded function. Thus, [19] shows that the RBSDE$\big(e^{\gamma\xi_j}, F^{j,n}_\psi, e^{\gamma L^j}\big)$ admits a maximal solution $\big(\widetilde{Y}^{j,n},\widetilde{Z}^{j,n},\widetilde{K}^{j,n}\big)$. We see from Remark 1 and Lemma 2.2 of [14] that $(\widetilde{u}^j(\cdot),0,0)$ is the unique solution of the RBSDE$(e^{\gamma b_j},\widetilde{\ell}\circ\rho, e^{\gamma b_j})$. Then Lemma 2.1 of [14] implies that P-a.s.

$$r \le e^{\gamma L^j_t} \le \widetilde{Y}^{j,n+1}_t \le \widetilde{Y}^{j,n}_t \le \widetilde{u}^j(t) \le \widetilde{u}^j(0) \le R \quad\text{and}\quad \widetilde{K}^{j,n}_t \le \widetilde{K}^{j,n+1}_t, \quad t\in[0,T].$$

Using the fact that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e., $F^{j,n}_\psi(t,\omega,y,z)$ converges to $F^j_\psi(t,\omega,\rho(y),z)$ for any $(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$, the proof of Theorem 2 in [14] shows that

$$\widetilde{Y}^j_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty}\downarrow \widetilde{Y}^{j,n}_t \in [r,R], \quad \widetilde{K}^j_t \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lim_{n\to\infty}\uparrow \widetilde{K}^{j,n}_t, \quad t\in[0,T], \tag{A.7}$$

and that the limit $\widetilde{Z}^j$ of $\Big\{\widetilde{Z}^{j,n}\Big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{H}^2_{\mathbf{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$ constitute a maximal bounded solution of the RBSDE$\big(e^{\gamma\xi_j}$, $F^j_\psi, e^{\gamma L^j}\big)$. Then the proof of Theorem 1 in [14] indicates that

$$(Y^j,Z^j,K^j) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\ln(\widetilde{Y}^j), (\gamma\widetilde{Y}^j)^{-1}\widetilde{Z}^j, \int_0^\cdot (\gamma\widetilde{Y}^j_s)^{-1}d\widetilde{K}^j_s\right) \tag{A.8}$$

is a maximal bounded solution of the RBSDE(ξ_j, f_j, L^j).

For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, it follows from (A.6) that $dt\otimes dP$-a.e.

$$F^{1,n}_\psi(t,\omega,y,z) \le F^{2,n}_\psi(t,\omega,y,z), \quad \forall\,(y,z)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d.$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.1 of [14] once again, it holds P-a.s. that $\widetilde{Y}^{1,n}_t \le \widetilde{Y}^{2,n}_t$ for any $t\in[0,T]$. As $n\to\infty$, one can deduce from (A.7) and (A.8) that P-a.s.

$$\widetilde{Y}^1_t \le \widetilde{Y}^2_t, \quad \text{thus} \quad Y^1_t \le Y^2_t, \quad \forall\, t\in[0,T]. \qquad \square$$

A.3 Two Gaps in [7].

(1) In [7], the authors fixed a $\mu\in(0,1)$ and chose an

$$L > C\big(1+(1-\mu)^{-p'}\big) \tag{A.9}$$

for some constant C (see line -5 of Lemma 3.4 of [7]). By setting $\tilde{u}(x,t) = e^{-Lt}u(x,t)+h(x)$ and $\tilde{v}(x,t) = e^{-Lt}v(x,t)+h(x)$, they showed that $\mu\tilde{u}-\tilde{v}\le 0$ step by step over each subinterval $\mathbb{R}^N\times\big[\frac{m-1}{L},\frac{m}{L}\big]$, $m = 1,\cdots,\lceil LT\rceil$. Thus

$$\mu\tilde{u}(x,t)-\tilde{v}(x,t)\le 0, \quad \forall\,(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^N\times[0,T]. \tag{A.10}$$

Then they claimed that letting $\mu \to 1$ results in

$$u(x,t) \le v(x,t), \quad \forall\,(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0,T] \tag{A.11}$$

(see proof of Theorem 3.1 of [7]). However, this is not true. Actually, (A.10) is equivalent to

$$\mu u(x,t) - v(x,t) \le e^{Lt}(1-\mu)h(x), \quad \forall\,(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0,T]. \tag{A.12}$$

As $\mu \to 1$, the right-hand-side of (A.12) goes to ∞ for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (0,T]$ since $L > C\big(1+(1-\mu)^{-p'}\big)$. Hence, their claim (A.11) fails.

(2) Moreover, their step-by-step method in showing that $\mu\tilde{u} - \tilde{v} \le 0$ holds over each subinterval $\mathbb{R}^N \times \big[\frac{m-1}{L}, \frac{m}{L}\big]$ may also cause a problem. This argument requires that $\mathcal{L}[\Phi(x,t)] > 0$ holds for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \big(\frac{m-1}{L}, \frac{m}{L}\big]$ (cf. Lemma 3.4 of [7]), which entails that

$$\frac{L}{4} - \frac{C_f e^{-Lt}}{\overline{C}} - p^{p'} C_s^{p'} \overline{C}^{p'-1} e^{Lp't} \Big(\frac{e^T}{1-\mu} + 1\Big)^{p'} \ge 1 \tag{A.13}$$

holds for any $t \in \big(\frac{m-1}{L}, \frac{m}{L}\big]$ (see line -8 of Lemma 3.4 of [7]). So it is necessary to have

$$L > \frac{4C_f}{\overline{C}} + 4p^{p'} C_s^{p'} \overline{C}^{p'-1} e^{mp'} \Big(\frac{e^T}{1-\mu} + 1\Big)^{p'} + 4. \tag{A.14}$$

When we take $m = \lfloor LT \rfloor$, the right hand side of (A.14) will be much larger than L, a contradiction appears.

However, one might try to change the test function Φ in Lemma 3.4 of [7] by some Φ_m over $\mathbb{R}^N \times \big(\frac{m-1}{L}, \frac{m}{L}\big]$, for example $\Phi_m(x,t) = \Phi(x, t - \frac{m-1}{L})$. Correspondingly, one has to show that

$$\mathcal{L}[\Phi_m(x,t)] > 0, \quad \text{for any } (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Big(\frac{m-1}{L}, \frac{m}{L}\Big].$$

In the last term of $\mathcal{L}[\Phi_m(x,t)]$ (see the definition of operator $\mathcal{L}$ in Lemma 3.2 of [7]), the fourth variable of function f still contains e^{Lt}. Then similar to line -8 of Lemma 3.4 of [7], the estimation for this function f still results in $e^{Lp't}$ on the right-hand-side, which shows that we are facing the same situation as in (A.13).

References

[1] E. Bayraktar, I. Karatzas, and S. Yao, *Optimal stopping for dynamic convex risk measures*, To appear in the Illinois Journal of Mathematics, (2011). Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0909.4948`.

[2] E. Bayraktar and S. Yao, *Optimal stopping for non-linear expectations–part II*, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications, 121 (2) (2011), pp. 212–264.

[3] V. E. Beneš, *Existence of optimal strategies based on specified information, for a class of stochastic decision problems*, SIAM J. Control, 8 (1970), pp. 179–188.

[4] P. Briand and Y. Hu, *BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 136 (2006), pp. 604–618.

[5] P. Briand and Y. Hu, *Quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 141 (2008), pp. 543–567.

[6] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), 27 (1992), pp. 1–67.

[7] F. Da Lio and O. Ley, *Uniqueness results for convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations under $p > 1$ growth conditions on data*, To appear in Appl. Math. Optim., (2010).

[8] F. Delbaen, Y. Hu, and A. Richou, *On the uniqueness of solutions to quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions*, To appear in Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., (2010).

[9] N. El Karoui, C. Kapoudjian, E. Pardoux, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez, *Reflected solutions of backward SDE's, and related obstacle problems for PDE's*, Ann. Probab., 25 (1997), pp. 702–737.

[10] N. El Karoui, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez, *Backward stochastic differential equations in finance*, Math. Finance, 7 (1997), pp. 1–71.

[11] R. J. Elliott, *Stochastic calculus and applications*, vol. 18 of Applications of Mathematics (New York), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

[12] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, vol. 113 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1991.

[13] M. Kobylanski, *Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth*, Ann. Probab., 28 (2000), pp. 558–602.

[14] M. Kobylanski, J. P. Lepeltier, M. C. Quenez, and S. Torres, *Reflected BSDE with superlinear quadratic coefficient*, Probab. Math. Statist., 22 (2002), pp. 51–83.

[15] J. P. Lepeltier and J. San Martín, *Backward stochastic differential equations with continuous coefficient*, Statist. Probab. Lett., 32 (1997), pp. 425–430.

[16] J.-P. Lepeltier and J. San Martín, *Existence for BSDE with superlinear-quadratic coefficient*, Stochastics Stochastics Rep., 63 (1998), pp. 227–240.

[17] J.-P. Lepeltier and M. Xu, *Reflected BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value*, tech. rep., Université du Maine and Fudan University, 2007. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0711.0619`.

[18] J. Ma and S. Yao, *On quadratic g-evaluations/expectations and related analysis*, Stoch. Anal. Appl., 28 (2010), pp. 711–734.

[19] A. Matoussi, *Reflected solutions of backward stochastic differential equations with continuous coefficient*, Statist. Probab. Lett., 34 (1997), pp. 347–354.

[20] M. Morlais, *Reflected backward stochastic differential equations and a class of non linear dynamic pricing rule*, tech. rep., University of Le Mans, 2008. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0802.2172`.

[21] É. Pardoux and S. Peng, *Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations*, in Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications (Charlotte, NC, 1991), vol. 176 of Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., Springer, Berlin, 1992, pp. 200–217.

[22] S. Peng, *Backward SDE and related g-expectation*, vol. 364 of Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., Longman, Harlow, 1997.

[23] S. Peng, *Nonlinear expectations, nonlinear evaluations and risk measures*, vol. 1856 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 2004.

[24] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997. Reprint of the 1970 original, Princeton Paperbacks.

[25] K. Yosida, *Functional analysis*, vol. 123 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, sixth ed., 1980.